ARUNDALE-JINARĀJADĀSA NUMBER

ब्रह्मविद्या BRAHMAVIDYĀ

THE ADYAR LIBRARY BULLETIN

तस्मै स विद्वानुपसन्नाय सम्यक्
प्रशान्तचित्ताय शमान्विताय ।
येनाक्षरं पुरुषं वेद सत्यं
प्रोवाच तां तत्त्वतो ब्रह्मविद्याम् ॥

UNTO him who approaches in due form, whose mind is serene and who has attained calmness, the wise one teaches in its very truth that Brahmavidya whereby one knows the Imperishable, the Purusha, the Truth.

Vol. X, Part 4 16th December, 1946

CONTENTS

THE "MYSTERIES"

BY H. S. OLCOTT

[With acknowledgments to the Editor of *The Theosophist*.]

THAT *Muó*, to shut the lips, to keep silence, is the Greek root of the word "Mysteries," every one readily admits; but to signify what was to be kept silent by those who where admitted "behind the veil" of Initiation, is now and has ever been impossible save to initiates. The lampooners and denunciators of our time have as little succeeded in shaking the faith of believers in the reality and value of mystical initiation, as did their precursors in the olden times that of their believing contemporaries. It has been simply the array of conjecture against experience, of surmise against knowledge. The wise have had but a feeling of contemptuous pity for the army of critics whose conclusions have rested upon mistaken premises, and whose verdict has been coloured by exaggerated prejudice and foolish mistrust. There is not an example recorded of anyone speaking irreverently of the course of initiation after having passed through it. On the other hand, the divinest characters in history who have been so blessed, have unanimously expressed their joy at having entered "The Path" and pursued it bravely to the end. Their testimony is that, until man has had this evolution, he cannot conceive of the nature of truth or the possibilities latent in humanity. "Happy," says Pindar, who passed through the august mysteries of Eleusis, "is he who has beheld them and descends beneath the hollow earth; he knows the end, he knows the divine origin of

life." As in Patanjali's system of Yoga the pupil goes gradually onward and upward, from the state of animal man, through the stages of self-mastery and psychic development, until he flowers into the true Yogi and unites his consciousness with the infinite, so in all the mystical schools of Greece, Rome, Egypt, and other trans-Himalayan countries he had to pass through a like education. Porphyry tells us that his master, Plotinus, was so fortunate as to have six times during his life experienced this blessed union, while he himself had done so but twice. Human knowledge, he avers, has three ascending steps; opinion, science, and *illumination*. The whole body of scientific critics who have discussed the subject of the mysteries *ab extra*, illustrate the first category; they dogmatize upon mere hypothesis. The second includes all seekers after and realizers of psychic powers, all phenomenalists—mesmeric, mediumistic, hypnotic, somnambulic, yogic: of the latter, all who acquire one or more *siddhis* and have gone no higher. The third group embraces the illuminated seers, sages, and adepts, in their grades above grades, to the top of the mystical hierarchy.

A modern writer [1] says that the mysteries being "founded on the adoration of nature (!), the forces and phenomena of which were conceived by the imagination and transformed into the characters of the mythology, they appealed to the eye rather than to the reason." If any proof were needed of his critical incompetence, we have it here. He does not seem to comprehend that the "rites of purification and expiation, of sacrifices and processions, of ecstatic or orgiastic songs and dances, of nocturnal festivals fit to impress the imagination, and of spectacles designed to excite the most diverse emotions, terror and trust, sorrow and joy, hope and despair" were but the incidents of the first threshold, tests to try the persistency, courage, unselfishness, purity, and intuitive capacity of the beginner. The calm, the peace, the inward elevation, the

[1] *The New American Cyclopædia*, Vol. XII, p. 75.

growth of spiritual insight, the majestic expansion of the petty ego or *ahankara*, towards universal consciousness, he does not picture to himself. Would the blaze, the awe and glitter of such ceremonials as shock the very core of the neophyte's being, extort from such masterful sages as Pythagoras, Plato, Iamblichus, Proclus, and Porphyry the reverently appreciative testimony they have left on record? Those spectacular shows of the antechamber were designed, according to Iamblichus, "to free us from licentious passions, by gratifying the sight, and at the same time vanquishing all evil thought, through the *awful sanctity* with which these rites were accompanied." The plan was the very reverse of that of the would-be adept who flees from mankind to the jungle and cave, where he may not see the objects that arouse evil passions. In the mysteries, the neophyte had to see the most voluptuous female forms, and expose himself to their most seductive blandishments; had to look, fasting, upon the most luscious banquets; had to see that by putting forth his hand he could grasp incalculable treasures; had to witness the seeming triumph of his bitterest foe over those in whom he was most interested; had to see manifold phenomena apparently resulting from the universe of powers, seemingly realizable by himself, without much effort; and yet so keep his soul-mastery as to neither give way to lust, appetite, avarice, hatred, revenge, or vanity. In the course of his trials, he would be made to think himself in peril of life from fire, water, lightning, earthquakes, precipices, savage beasts, assassins, and other catastrophies, yet all the while be expected to preserve an equal serenity and dauntless pluck. This was the price exacted in exchange for the attainment of godhood, the ordeal for the discovery of the candidate's innate trustworthiness; this was INITIATION.

What wonder that the secret of the mysteries has been inviolably kept by initiates through all times and ages! To men of such stuff as that, the feeble chatter, the wretched persecutions, the "toy-thunders" of bigotry, the physical anguish

of torture chambers, all that an ignorant brutal society can visit upon them to wrest their ineffable secret from their lips, were absurdly ineffectual. Where can we find a grander embodiment of this idea than in the story of the discomfiture of Mara, dread sovereign of evil, by our Lord Buddha, under the sacred tree at Gaya? In this splendid epic is depicted the whole sequence of initiations accredited to the mysteries of Eleusis, Samothrace, Lemnos, Isis and Osiris, Mithra, Orpheus, Dionysos, Scandinavia, and the trans-Atlantic Mayas, Quiches and Peruvians. As there is but one secret of life, there could never have been more than one channel for attaining the highest knowledge of it. If the preliminary ceremonials took on the local colouring of mythologies there was but one truth hidden "behind the veil." Those who, in our own days, have been blessed with personal relations with the "Wise Men of the East" have found them teaching an identical philosophy, whether they were externally Hindu, Buddhist, Christian, Jew, Parsi, or Mussalman as to social environment and nominal caste. And what they are now teaching is the same as that which was taught to students in all countries, at all preceding epochs. It is for the purpose of illustrating this fact that occultists take so much interest in deciphering old temple inscriptions, poring over old MSS., studying old symbols carven on crumbling ruins, and trying to piece together the fragments of books which the vanished fraternities of Asia, Africa, Europe, and America succeeded in saving for us their posterity, when they fell victims to the cruel violence of their persecutors. This is the reason why it is so well worth our while to read the Egyptian books of Hermes, the hieroglyphs in the ruined temples of Khemi, the fragmentary archives of the Rosicrucians, the poetry of the Sufis, the weird sagas of Northern Europe, the mural inscriptions of Central America, and to analyse and synthesize the folklore, legends, and folk-songs of many lands. Those who devote themselves to this research are doing it less for

their own profit than to collate for the benefit of the thinking public a mass of proof of the eternal unity of esoteric truth. As the geographer traces the dripping cloud through a thousand streams to the river and the sea, and from the sea back to the sky, so do these investigators follow back the boundless ocean of occult truth to its divine source, through multitudinous wanderings of its branchlets among men.

It seems but a waste of energy to dispute as to the comparative antiquity of the mysteries. The end of all the speculation and research of the pandits and professors is that they can fix with certainty no date for their beginning. Reaching a certain point, they are forced to admit that beyond that conjecture alone is possible. The most practical issue is whether the ancient mysteries subserved an immoral or a moral purpose, whether they were designed for the education of students in physical sciences, for supporting local religious beliefs, for enhancing the importance, emoluments and prerogatives of priests, for the overthrow of old and establishment of new theologies, or for the very purpose stated by the sages named, and others who had received full initiation. Dr. Warburton admits (in his *Divine Legation of Moses*,) that "the wisest and best men in the Pagan world are unanimous in this, that the mysteries were instituted pure, and proposed the noblest ends by the worthiest means."

The encyclopædist above quoted also testifies that "the Eleusinian were the most venerable of the mysteries, and in every period of classical antiquity commanded the homage alike of the most distinguished poets, philosophers, historians, and statesmen." Can anyone, then, believe that they were but a superior kind of *tamasha*, such as are gotten up to excite the wonder of the ignorant masses? Is it presumable that they could have been kept up through successive generations always winning the same praise and arousing the same awe-begotten reverence in sober minds, if they had been what our modern critics, our Welckers and Maurys, our Magnussens, Vosses,

Lobecks, and Prellers imagine, or, as Tertullian and other Fathers of the Church try to imply, a mixture of Christian and Pagan dogmas and ceremonies? When one comes to look through the books written by these worthies, one is struck with the actual ignorance accompanied by hardy guessing, which all display. At the best, they seem but to be looking at the subject from afar through the telescope of conjecture, not even to be getting a peep from the threshold into the vestibule of the sacred caverns. Most exasperating of all is it to read such works as Tom Moore's *Epicurean or a Day in Athens*, and see him first describing the experiences of a neophyte who had passed through a series of trials, the very recital of which shows how impossible it was to ascribe them to trickery, and then, when the attempt is quite useless, to try and make the reader believe them to have been produced by a lot of stage machinery, such as might catch the fancy of a theatrical audience. One wishes, after reading such a book, that the author had either been more clever himself or less ready to doubt the reader's common sense. Either his neophyte never passed through such scenes, or the author's attempt at explanation is transparently absurd and childish. It reminds one of the endeavours of some prejudiced Orientalists to cramp and crowd Aryan history and literature into the iron frame of biblical chronology, and to trace the families of mankind to three sons of Noah who never existed.

The ancient mysteries, modern initiation, and all mystical occupation rest upon the doctrine that man can never learn through the bodily senses, the secrets of life and the problem of the universe. The eye, the ear, and all other organs of the body are but avenues of perception of the gross physical world about us. Mechanically adapted to our exterior environment, they have no higher functions than to record its impressions upon that lower part of ourself which is built out of matter, and destined to resolve into its elements, sooner or later.

Reason is but the analyst and the synthesist of these impressions. Between it and ultimate knowledge hang numberless veils. Man is a congeries of various "principles," some say three, some four, some seven; but whatever the correct number, all are included between two extreme points, the one which is in contact with the grossest, the other with the most sublime, consciousness. So long as one's perceptions are restricted to sensuous experiences, one's knowledge will be proportionately small; to become truly wise, one must burst the bonds of illusion, tear away the curtain of Maya, break the chains of passion, know the self and put it in command of our consciousness and our actions. The neophyte is never in greater danger of falling a victim to delusion than when he has subjected his grosser passions and begun to develop his psychic sight, hearing, and touch. He is like the new-born babe getting its first lessons of cis-uterine life, grasping at the pretty silver moon, clutching at fire and lamp, miscalculating distances, tottering upon its feeble legs. He has forced himself into the vestibule of the astral world, as yet unprepared to understand his surroundings, ignorant of his latent powers of mastery and insight. If he gets himself out of the body and attempts phantasmal excursions, he is like the nestling trying its baby-wings. "The viewless races of the air," the sprites of the elemental world, rush about him in all sorts of fantastic shapes, some alluring, some terrifying; the larvæ or undissolved astral bodies—D'Assier's "posthumous phantoms"—of human dead persons, float past and eddy around, like corpses in river currents. Then his inner ear opens to the mysterious sounds of this phantom world, and he recoils in affright from the awful tales, the groans and sighs, and other things he hears. Pictures impressed by vivid human thought upon the earth's astral envelope, and fresh ones created by his own untaught imagination, surround him with an unreal world, which yet has to him the actual semblance of reality. He is, as Patanjali describes

it, under the influence of the "local gods." Now is his time to acquire psychic "science," to learn the laws of this middle region, and see through all illusions. If he be under a guru's care, (and supremely foolish is he who neglects this preliminary) he will be watched over and looked after, as the tender mother cares for her child; and, as the teacher eagerly helps the willing scholar to master the difficulties of his text-books, so this greater master is ready to meet half-way the aspiring *chela* who TRIES, as the maxim of initiation inculcates. But there are deeper mysteries of the penetralia which are never revealed by the initiator to the neophyte; they must be reached by his unaided effort; for they are personal, pertaining to absolute knowledge, and never capable of communication by third parties. . . .

But is there no recompense for those who fail in initiation through miscalculation of their power to realise the ideal psychic development? Certainly there is: the attainment of perfection is but postponed to a future birth. Every preliminary step in self-conquest and self-knowledge is so much experience and developed power, stored up psychic energy, for the use of the individuality in its next incarnation. The divine Krishna answers Arjuna, who had put this very question: "Doth not the fool who is found not standing in the path of Brahm, and is thus, as it were, fallen between good and evil, like a broken cloud, come to nothing?" "A man"—says Krishna—"whose devotions have been broken off by death, having enjoyed for an immensity of years the rewards of his virtues in the regions above,[1] at length is born again in some holy and respectable family, or perhaps in the house of some learned Yogi . . . Being thus born again, he is endued with the same degree of application and advancement of his understanding that he held in his former body, and here he begins again to labour for perfection in devotion."

[1] This idea is developed by Mr. Sinnett in *Esoteric Buddhism*.

BHAGAVADGĪTĀ AND THE MĪMĀṀSĀ[1]

By Dr. C. Kunhan Raja

It is doubtful if another work in India has received the same attention and veneration as the *Bhagavadgītā*. There is no language with a literature, in which the text has not been made available through a translation; and in some languages, like the English language, there are innumerable translations. Still it is doubtful if there is another work which has been so little understood as this great work. It is the simplest work and yet it is the most difficult work to grasp. There are various points on which there have been serious controversies, apart from the great difficulty in understanding individual words and passages. Does the work teach active life, or active life with complete surrender to the Lord (Bhakti), or complete renunciation? Does it advocate war in defence of righteousness or does it advocate unqualified non-violence? Does it uphold the doctrine of monism or qualified monism or dualism? There have ever been such doctrinal controversies.

Does the text really contain only the seven hundred verses now current, or is the present text different from an original form with seven hundred and forty verses? If this is not the original text, what is the text with seven hundred and forty verses? This is another problem.

[1] Submitted to the Indian Philosophical Congress, held at Trivandrum, in December 1945.

Was the *Bhagavadgītā* even in its origin a part of the *Mahābhārata*, or was it an original, independent text later incorporated into the great epic? Is it given a place within the epic in a natural context or does the text show marked contrasts from its context? If it were an independent work, was this its original form or has it been tampered with? This is a third problem. There have been filtrations to get at the original form of the independent text. Richard Garbe tried the process, and his disciple Rudolph Otto tried the experiment in a much stricter way, and produced his "Original *Gītā*."

In this Paper I am not interested in any of these problems. There is another set of problems that agitates the minds of many students. There is a distinct *Upaniṣadic* note in the whole of the *Gītā*; no one can miss it. There is a *Sāṅkhya* element; this too is very prominent. Then there is a *Mīmāṁsā* element which is quite discernible in the text. It is the difficulty of mixing all these elements into a cogent whole that has given worry to the students; and as a matter of fact, this is one of the reasons for Rudolph Otto attempting a process of filtration. And he has filtered away the entire *Mīmāṁsā* element. Even in the case of Indian students, there is a sort of preference for detecting non-orthodox elements in the text, and there is a tendency to regard the *Gītā* as something different from the orthodox Vedic Path.

Dr. S. K. Belvalkar has brought together, in his critical exposition of the argument added to his translation of the *Gītā*, a large number of points on which there is enunciated a contrast, even a conflict, between the *Mīmāṁsā* view of *Karma* and the *Gītā* view of *Karma*. For the purpose which I have in view I consider it convenient to take those points and consider the problem. It should not be thought that I have taken

these points from the text to openly attack the great scholar. It is only practical convenience that has persuaded me to take up the points as enunciated by him. He has given eight points on P. xxi. I take them and consider how far there is any contrast or conflict between the *Gītā* view of *Karma* and the *Mīmāṁsā* view.

The first point is that, according to *Mīmāṁsā*, the fruit is possible only for fully finished *Karmas*, with all the elaborations, with all the methodical exactitude regarding materials, sequence and ceremonials, while the *Gītā* does not insist on these for gaining the fruit. The *Gītā* passage is :

नेहाभिक्रमनाशोऽस्ति प्रत्यवायो न विद्यते । स्वल्पमप्यस्य धर्मस्य त्रायते महतो भयात् ॥ (II. 40)

पार्थ नैवेह नामुत्र विनाशस्तस्य विद्यते । (VI. 40)

We have to consider if there is a conflict between the two views about *Dharma*. The fact is that *Dharma* means one thing in the *Mīmāṁsā* and another thing in the *Bhagavadgītā*. In the *Mīmāṁsā S'āstra* a term is explained if the term has a special meaning in the *S'astra* different from its normal meaning. If the word is used in the normal meaning, it must be understood in that meaning and no explanation is given. This is what S'abara says :

लोके येष्वर्थेषु प्रसिद्धानि पदानि तानि सति संभवे तदर्थान्येव सूत्रेष्वित्यवगन्तव्यम् । नाध्याहारादिभिरेषां परिकल्पनीयोऽर्थः परिभाषितव्यो वा । (I. i. 1.)

Dharma means sacrifice in the Vedas, as in the passage :

यज्ञेन यज्ञमयजन्त देवास्तानि धर्माणि प्रथमान्यासन् । (R. V. 1. 164. 50)

But the word means any virtuous deed in ordinary language. *Mīmāṁsā S'āstra* uses the word in a restricted sense and so it

has to give the explanation as: चोदनालक्षणोऽर्थो धर्मः (I. 1. 2). *Dharma* is an *Artha*, a desirable act, for which the only authority is the scriptural prescription (चोदना). There are so many good acts which are known to be good from their good results. They do not come under the term *Dharma* in *Mīmāṁsā*. Where the result is not a tangible one as in the case of *Svarga* accruing from *Jyotiṣṭoma* or where the result may be a tangible one but where its causal relation to the act is not known by ordinary experience as in *Citrā Yāga* resulting in the acquisition of cows (चित्रया यजेत पशुकामः) the only authority for the act to be a good one which will bring about desirable results is the Vedic prescription. *Mīmāṁsā* deals only with such *Dharma*. Here every *Dharma* first produces an *Adṛṣṭa* and that *Adṛṣṭa* finally produces either a tangible fruit as cows in the case of *Citrā Yāga* or an intangible fruit like *Svarga* in the case of *Jyotiṣṭoma*. But in all Vedic prescriptions, the primary fruit resulting from doing the act is an *Adṛṣṭa*.

Now when the result is an *Adṛṣṭa*, how can one assert that a result is possible even by an incomplete performance of the act prescribed, though the fruit too may be incomplete? From the prescription all that we know is that either an *Adṛṣṭa* is produced from the performance, or it is not produced from non-performance and from incomplete or imperfect performance. But there is no authority for an incomplete or imperfect fruit.

Bhagavadgītā deals with quite a different sort of *Dharma*. Where does the statement about partial fruits from incomplete deeds appear? It is after dealing with the *Sāṅkhya* point of view and when the *Yoga* point of view is taken up. The immediately preceding verse is

एषा तेऽभिहिता सांख्ये बुद्धिर्योगे त्विमां श्रृणु । (II. 39)

Then comes the statement,

नेहाभिक्रमनाशोऽस्ति प्रत्यवायो न विद्यते । (II. 40)

Again in the sixth Chapter dealing with *Yoga*, there is the question :

अयतिः श्रद्धयोपेतो योगाच्चलितमानसः ।
अप्राप्य योगसंसिद्धिं कां गतिं कृष्ण गच्छति (VI. 37)

This has reference to the discipline of the mind. If the mind is disciplined to some extent in this birth, its fruits will continue in the next birth. The result from the *Yogic* practice, which is the point at issue, is a tangible result and not an *Adṛṣṭa*. In both the places, the development of the *Buddhi* is the subject-matter ; and so far as the development of *Buddhi* is concerned, the result is not an *Adṛṣṭa*, and as such, there can be partial result from partial act, just as by eating a little the hunger also can be satisfied partially. So far as acts with an *Adṛṣṭa* fruit is concerned, *Bhagavadgītā* accepts the *Mīmāṁsā* position that they should be performed according to proper prescriptions. And the following passages may be taken note of :

यजन्ते नामयज्ञैस्ते दम्भेनाविधिपूर्वकम् । (XVI. 17)
यः शास्त्रविधिमुत्सृज्य वर्तते कामकारतः । (XVI. 23)
तस्माच्छास्त्रं प्रमाणं . . . ? ज्ञात्वा (XVI. 24)
ये शास्त्रविधिमुत्सृज्य यजन्ते (XVII. 1)
अशास्त्रविहितं घोरम (XVII. 5)
विधिदृष्टो य इज्यते (XVII. 11)
विधिहीनमसृष्टान्नम् (XVII. 13)

Dharma S'āstra deals with two kinds of *Dharma*. *Dharma* is of the nature of an act. There are certain acts whose fruit is not known to be causally related to the act by any experiences of ours, whose relation to the fruit is known only from a Vedic prescription; such are the good deeds known from चोदना and they are dealt with in the *Mīmāṁsā*. Thus *Mīmāṁsā S'āstra* defines its subject matter as चोदना-लक्षणोऽर्थः।

There are other acts whose causal relation to the fruit is known from experience, perhaps only from the *Yogic* experience of some *Siddhas*. They are dealt with in other kinds of *Dharma S'āstras* which begin as अथातः सामयाचारिकान् धर्मान् व्याख्यास्यामः। *Samaya* and *Ācāra* are based upon what the great Teachers say. It is true that they too have to be ultimately based upon what the *S'āstra* speaks of, as lost Vedic prescriptions. But that is another story. The fact that there is development of mental powers through the *Yogic* practice is known to the *Ṛṣis* from their own experiences. But the relation of *Jyotiṣṭoma* to *Svarga* and of *Citrā Yāga* to the acquisition of cows cannot be so known. So the *Gītā* simply confirms the very orthodox view of Hinduism that the results of *Yoga* can be accumulated, and even when things are left at the half stage, there is no loss. But in the matter of *Yāgas*, they must be done according to the Vedic prescription, and what are not done according to the prescriptions come under the condemnable class of rites. Yet Dr. S. K. Belvalkar writes: "It is for this reason that the Yoga is also styled *Karmayoga* and is purposely contrasted, right at the outset, with another more familar method of performing prescribed or *S'āstravihitakarma*, *viz.*, the *Karmakāṇḍa* or sacrificial ritual of the *Mīmāṁsakas*." (P. xx).

Now the contrast, according to Dr. Belvalkar, is in the passages :

नेहाभिक्रमनाशोऽस्ति प्रत्यवायो न विद्यते ।
स्वल्पमप्यस्य धर्मस्य त्रायते महतो भयात् ॥
व्यवसायात्मिका बुद्धिरेकेह कुरुनन्दन ।
बहुशाखा ह्यनन्ताश्च बुद्धयोऽव्यवसायिनाम् ॥
यामिमां पुष्पितां वाचं प्रवदन्त्यविपश्चितः ।
वेदवादरताः पार्थ नान्यदस्तीति वादिनः ॥
कामात्मानः स्वर्गपरा जन्मकर्मफलप्रदाम् ।
क्रियाविशेषबहुलां भोगैश्वर्यगतिं प्रति ॥
भोगैश्वर्यप्रसक्तानां तयापहृतचेतसाम ।
व्यवसायात्मिका बुद्धिः समाधौ न विधीयते ॥
त्रैगुण्यविषया वेदा निस्त्रैगुण्यो भवार्जुन ।
निर्द्वन्द्वो नित्यसत्त्वस्थो निर्योगक्षेम आत्मवान् ॥
यावानर्थ उदपाने सर्वतः संप्लुतोदके ।
तावान् सर्वेषु वेदेषु ब्राह्मणस्य विजानतः ॥ (II. 40—46)

Now, where is the contrast ? What do these verses come to ? There is *Vyavasāyabuddhi* and *Avyavasāyabuddhi*. The former has only one goal, while the latter branches off in different ways. Those who are not *Vipaścits* call the Vedic words as florid and they say that there is nothing beyond. They are moved only by certain desires ; their goal is Heaven. These words, according to them, give births, acts and their fruits ; there are various kinds of excellent acts ; they lead to enjoyment here and *Aiśvarya* after death. When their mind is addicted to enjoyment and *Aiśvarya*, their *Buddhi* is not prescribed as *Vyavasāyātmikā* for *Samādhi*. It is only *Vyvasāyabuddhi* that is prescribed for *Samādhi*. It is not

meant that even such persons have *Vyavasāyabuddhi*, but that it is not prescribed for *Samādhi*. Such persons do not have a *Vyavasāyabuddhi*.

This is not a condemnation of *Mīmāṁsā*. What *Mīmāṁsā* deals with is the relation of *Karma* and *Phala* as prescribed in the Vedas. There is no *Vidhi* for final *Mokṣa* like the *Svargavidhi*. So the question of *Mokṣa* does not come within the limited field taken up by the *Mīmāṁsā* for consideration which is only that *Dharma* which can be defined as चोदनालक्षण.

One is not sure whether a *Mīmāṁsā* dictum like न कदाचिदनीदृशं जगत् has reference to denial of *Mokṣa* for the individual at all. Perhaps it has reference only to *Sarvamukti*. Life and moral order in the world are eternal. But worldly experience for the individual is not permanent. There is *Mokṣa* for the individual. But the question of *Mokṣa* does not come within the scope of the *Pūrvamīmāṁsā S'astra*. That is left to the *Uttaramīmāṁsā*. Thus the contrast is only between (1) a possible view that the *Yāgas* are to be performed in a mechanical way as a mere ceremonial, without any function for the *Buddhi*, without the need to understand the Vedas, studying only the recitation of the Vedas for the proper use at the *Yāgas* and (2) the more intelligent view that the *Yāgas* prescribed in the Vedas take man only some steps along the path of evolution, that even in this step there must be training of the *Buddhi*, that there must be the final goal beyond the *Karmas* and that all *Karmas* must point to one goal beyond.

Kumārila Bhaṭṭa must be presumed to give us a traditional view handed down from generation to generation; he could not have been giving us a brand new view of *Mīmāṁsā*. Kumārila accepts the doctrine of *Mokṣa* for the *Jīvas*. Even Prabhākara, who regards the Vedic prescriptions in a much

more rigid way than Kumārila, does not deny *Mokṣa*. Their position on the subject of *Mokṣa* is given in a very lucid way by Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa in his *Mānameyodaya* :

सकलबुद्ध्यादिविशेषगुणविलये सति आत्मनः स्वरूपावस्थानं मोक्ष इति प्राभाकरमतम् । (II. ii. 116)

निषिद्धकाम्यकर्मभ्यः सम्यग्व्यावृत्तचेतसः ।
नित्यनैमित्तिकप्रायश्चित्तप्रध्वस्तदुष्कृतेः ॥
सुखदुःखानुभूतिभ्यां क्षीणप्रारब्धकर्मणः ।
युक्तस्य ब्रह्मचर्याद्यैरङ्गैः शमदमादिभिः ॥
कुर्वाणस्यात्ममीमांसां वेदान्तोक्तेन वर्त्मना ।
मुक्तिः सम्पद्यते सद्यो नित्यानन्दप्रकाशिनी ॥ (II. ii. 123)

Not only is this so; the true position of *Mīmāṁsā* is clearly explained in the verses of the *Gītā* that follow the verses that were commented upon above. In these verses, it is said that the Vedas deal only with the worldly life composed of the modifications of the three *Guṇas*. But one must always look to beyond this differentiation. When one gets beyond the stage of the *Karmas*, the Vedas have no more purpose. This is true of the individual, though for the other individuals in the world who have not made the same progress, Vedas have a purpose. In these six verses cited by Dr. Belvalkar, the *Mīmāṁsā* position is truly presented; there is no contrast between the *Mīmāṁsā* and *Bhagavad Gitā Karma Yoga*.

The next verse in the same context makes the position of *Mīmāṁsā* still more clear. The verse is :

कर्मण्येवाधिकारस्ते मा फलेषु कदाचन ।
मा कर्मफलहेतुर्भूर्मा ते सङ्गोऽस्त्वकर्मणि ॥ (II. 47)

This verse brings us on to the question of *Karma*-bondage. I do not know if there is another passage in the whole of the *Gītā* which has been so misinterpreted as the above verse. Take for example the translation of Dr. Belvalkar. It runs:

> Thou hast a rightful title to action but only to action; never at all to its fruitions. Let not the fruits of action be thy inspiring motive. Nor let thy attachment be to inaction.

What does he mean by the expression, "rightful title"?. It is the translation of the Sanskrit word अधिकार. So far as I can see, in this passage is given the true *Mīmāṁsā* position of who the *adhikārin* to a *Karma* is. In fixing the *Adhīkāra*, only the *Karma* comes in and not its *Phala*. According to Prabhākara, *kāryabodha*, the feeling that this is to be done by me (मयेदं कर्तव्यमिति बोधः) is what is called *Adhikāra*. *Kārya* is what is to be done or what is to be produced and that is the *Apūrva*. Every action done according to *Codanā* necessarily produces an *Apūrva*. Even where there is a *Phala*, it is not the *Phala* that gives the urge to man to do the action; it is the Vedic prescription itself.

Man as a citizen must live according to law. It is not for him to question law. Law is correct. That is the primary axiom. So when a citizen obeys law, it is not because such obedience brings him any advantage or because its disobedience brings him disadvantage, but because it is law. The relation between the action and its fruit is determined when the law is laid down, and a citizen, when he functions as a citizen, must be presumed to obey the law as law, not as something which brings about a result. The Veda prescribes the causal relation of *Jyotiṣṭoma* with *Svarga* or of *Citrā* with

cows, through some *Apūrva*. If, at every stage, the result also comes in as a factor in determining whether a man need do a thing already established by law, then law cannot function.

On the nineteenth of November of this year, Sachivottama Sir C. P. Raṁaswami Aiyar spoke in Madras on *Gītā* and in the course of the talk he is reported to have said " One's duty was to perform what lay next to one; it was not one's prerogative to be meticulous about the results " (Report in the *Hindu* of 20-11-45). If the implication is that the results do not matter in an action, the remark is wide of the truth. It is because the causal relation between the action and the fruit has already been fixed, that one is asked not to entertain attachment to the result. His attachment does not alter the result and, as such, his attachment to the result may only adversely affect the fruition. One does a thing because one knows that, by doing it, some specific result will be produced. Without this certainty he will not and need not do it. What makes no difference in regard to the result need not be done. In every *Bhāvanā* there are three factors; the instrument (करण) in the production, the result that is produced (भाव्य) and the mode of operation in bringing about the result (इतिकर्तव्यता). *Bhāvanā* itself means production. It is defined as भवितुर्भवनानुकूलो भावकव्यापारविशेषः *i.e.*, a functioning of the producer which is conducive to the production of what is produced. Thus the result is an intimate factor in every action.

It is true that Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and his followers have introduced the element of result (फल) as a factor in determining *Adhikāra*. To them *Adhikāra* is *Phalakāmanā*. This is one of the fundamental differences between Prabhākara and

Kumārila. *Gītā* upholds the Prābhākara view. And in all places in the *Gītā* where the words *Niyata*, *Kārya* etc. come in, this Prābhākara view is very prominent. One may note the following passages :

नियतं कुरु कर्म त्वम् (III. 8)
कार्यं कर्म समाचर (III. 19)
अनाश्रितः कर्मफलं कार्यं कर्म करोति यः (VI. 1)
तस्माच्छास्त्रं प्रमाणं ते कार्याकार्यव्यवस्थितौ । ज्ञात्वा शास्त्र-
विधानोक्तम् (XVI. 24)
नियतस्य तु संन्यासः कर्मणो नोपपद्यते (XVIII. 7)
कार्यमित्येव यत्कर्म नियतं कुरुतेऽर्जुन (XVIII. 9)
प्रवृत्तिं च निवृत्तिं च कार्याकार्ये भयाभये (XVIII. 30)
यया धर्ममधर्मं च कार्यं चाकार्यमेव च (XVIII. 31)

When we analyse the position, all the eight points which Prof. Belvalkar has given in two columns as contrast between the *Karmakāṇḍa* of *Mīmāṁsā* and the *Karmayoga* of the *Bhagavadgītā* can be reduced to two main points, namely, the meticulous care regarding the details and the relation of the doer to the results. In both of these cases, what the *Gīta* does is to correctly interpret the *Mīmāṁsā* position. When the relation of the action to the result through an *Apūrva* can be known only from a Vedic prescription, then the action must be done according to the Vedic prescription. By performing the *Jyotiṣṭoma* in an imperfect way or by leaving it in an incomplete stage, one cannot hope to get occasional or partial *Svarga*. Similarly by performing the *Citrā Yāga* in an imperfect way one cannot hope to get a barren cow.

Regarding results of actions that are to be determined by man's experience, the action may be done according to experience and there will be partial results for partial deeds.

In the matter of the relation of the doer to the result, this result is detemined by the law of causation, and one has only to do the thing; his attachment to the result will not bring him any better results; perhaps such attachment may bring about a defect in the action, and consequently in the results also. Such deflection from the action in consequence of the attachment to the fruit is sure to affect his further progress. This position is quite acceptable to all the *Mīmāṁsakas*, both Kumārila and Prabhākara. Even Kumārila does not advocate *Phalasaṅga*, though he brings *Phala* as a factor in determining the question of *Adhikāra*.

Carefully scrutinised, the difference between Kumārila and Prabhākara is very little. One speaks of *Iṣṭasādhanatābodha* as *Adhikāra* and the other as *Kāryatābodha*. According to Kumārila, the *Adhikārin* has the conviction that the action prescribed by the Veda is the means to a fruit that is desirable. According to Prabhākara, an *Apūrva* will be produced from the action prescribed by the Veda. The expression मयेदं कार्यं means that this *Apūrva* is the result of my action. Faith in the infallibility of the Vedas is a common factor. The only difference is in the relative importance of faith in the Veda and the results prescribed in the Veda being what is desirable.

But in both cases, the relation of the result to the action as cause is determined by the law of causation, as stated in the Vedas, and as such, one has only to do the thing. One should not waver between the action leading to the results and failing to lead to the results. This is the *samatva*, the equipoise.

If there is the passage :

> यावानर्थ उदपाने सर्वतः संप्लुतोदके ।
> तावान् सर्वेषु वेदेषु ब्राह्मणस्य विजानतः ॥ (II. 46)

then there are also passages like

> सहयज्ञाः प्रजाः सृष्ट्वा पुरोवाच प्रजापतिः ।
> अनेन प्रसविष्यध्वमेष वोऽस्त्विष्टकामधुक् ॥
> देवान् भावयतानेन ते देवा भावयन्तु वः ।
> परस्परं भावयन्तः श्रेयः परमवाप्स्यथ ॥
> इष्टान् भोगान् हि वो देवा दास्यन्ते यज्ञभाविताः ।
> तैर्दत्तानप्रदायैभ्यो यो भुङ्क्ते स्तेन एव सः ॥ (III. 10-12)

What the *Gītā* says is what *Mīmāṁsā* has accepted, that in the life of an individual the Vedic rites have an importance only at a certain stage. But in the world it has a permanent impotance; if one individual gets beyond it, there are other individuals within the prescriptions of the Vedas.

I do not propose to enter on the difficult task of determining the meanings of terms like *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga*, and *Karma*, *Akarma* and *Vikarma*. I have here dealt with only the problem of any doctrinal conflict between the *Gītā* and the *Mīmāṁsā*, and my definite view is that the *Gītā* truly reflects the view of *Mīmāṁsā*.

THE ETHICS OF THE BHAGAVADGĪTĀ[1]

By Mrs. Ratna Shivaram, M.A.

The Ethics of the Bhagavad Gītā is grounded in its metaphysics. The Gītā is said to be the 'focus of Indian religion' and the best commentary on the Vedāntic philosophy. The doctrine which stands out luminously in almost every chapter of the Gītā is intense activity, in the midst of which there is tranquillity of heart as well as equanimity of mind. Exponents of the Gītā differ as to its central teaching. Some have held that the Gītācārya advocates and preaches mainly Karma-Yoga as according to Tilak or mainly Jñāna-Yoga as according to S'rī S'aṅkara or Bhakti-Yoga as according to S'rī Rāmānuja. Some others have divided the eighteen chapters of the Gītā into three ṣaṭkas, the first six dealing with Karma-Yoga, the second six with Bhakti-Yoga and the last six with Jñāna-Yoga. Though there are verses in the Gītā which lend support to everyone of the above doctrines, the fact is that the Gītā does not advocate any single doctrine or school of thought as such. There are only two streams of thought flowing throughout the Gītā—a metaphysical and an ethical dealing respectively with what God is and what man ought to do.[2] In some chapters the ethical strain is more than the metaphysical and in some others it is just the opposite, while in yet others

[1] Read at the Indian Philosophical Congress, Trivandrum, December 1945.
[2] D. S. Śarma, *Lectures on the Bhagavad-Gītā*, p. 18.

they are dealt with side by side. The ethics of the Gītā is based on the knowledge of the Absolute Śelf. It sets forth a philosophy of life and is looked upon with deep reverence for the lofty and inspired message and the vision that it inspires, a vision that can be carried into and put to practical application in our every day life, wherever we are and in whatever condition of life, in freedom or in servitude, in the height of glory or in the depth of degradation. In the teaching of the Gītā 'the good has found a place with the true and the true has not been sacrificed at the altar of the good.'[1]

The content of the Gītā is given in the colophon at the end of every chapter of the Book. "Thus in the song of the Lord in the Upaniṣad, in the science of the Absolute, in the scripture of Yoga, in the dialogue between S'rī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna this is chapter entitled, etc." The central purpose of the teaching being to solve the problem of life and stimulate right conduct, it is called by the author himself as Yoga-s'āstra. Its message is Yoga, its god is Yoges'vara and the ideal man it describes is a Yogin. The whole import of the teaching of S'rī Kṛṣṇa is contained in these four words, Yoga, Yogin, Yoges'vara and Yoga-s'āstra. All these words together occur about 80 times in the Gītā.[2] The word Yoga has been used in different senses in the Gītā in different places to suit the purpose of the author. Sometimes it is used in the sense of Pātañjala Yoga (VIII. 6 and 23). In VII. 25-29 it has been used in the sense of divine skill or the wonderful power of the Lord in creating the variegated perceptible creation and so he has been referred to as Yoges'vara. The word Yoga has been defined by the Lord Himself in II. 48 where He advises Arjuna to attain to 'Yoga' which means 'Evenness

[1] Mahendranath Sircar, *Mysticism in the Gītā*, p. 23.
[2] Ṭilak, *Gītārahasya*, Ch. III, pp. 71-78.

of Mind'. To begin with He tells Arjuna how the minds of the irresolute are disintegrated, being engrossed in desire-prompted actions; therefore he (Arjuna) should not allow his mind to be disintegrated in this manner and should give up all desire-prompted actions, for it is when one is attached to works and its fruits that one becomes miserable and is affected by the sin or virtue of those Actions. Therefore one should become steeped in Yoga. A man of even mind, it is said, puts away here both good and evil, therefore one should strive for Yoga. Yoga, S'rī Kṛṣṇa further describes as skill in action' (II. 50). It is the intelligent way of performing one's work with the central being of one's soul untouched, the method by which one can reach the highest end which, according to the Gītā, is Mokṣa, *i.e.* becoming Brahman or touching the Eternal. This union or fellowship can be reached by different Yogas, that of right action, loving devotion, intense meditation or mystic devotion, and respectively we have Karma-Yoga, Bhakti-Yoga, Dhyāna-Yoga and Jñāna-Yoga. The Gītā thus classifies religious aspirants into four broad divisions, the active man, the emotional man, the mystic man and the man of reason. But these are not mutually exclusive of one another; they also exist in every mind to some extent or other. The goal to be attained is called Yoga. 'Equanimity of mind' and the path which leads to it is also called Yoga by a 'transference' of the term. "The Gītā treats the Yoga which is the goal as well as the path of religious life as one organic whole, though it dwells now on one aspect of it and now on the other."[1] The practicability of the Gītā lies just here, in its recognition of the varieties of minds and inclinations. In IV. 11 says S'rī Kṛṣṇa: "Howsoever men approach me even so do I accept them, for on all sides whatever path they

[1] D. S. Ṣarma, *op. cit.* p. 24.

choose is mine, O Pārtha" provided the goal is the Eternal, the Absolute Self. While at the same time denouncing the religious madness of the hermits and the spiritual suicide of the saints who prefer darkness to light and sorrow to joy, the Gītā fosters a life of the spirit. In the words of Sir S. Radhakrishnan, 'the Gītā attempts a spiritual synthesis which could support life and conduct on the basis of upaniṣadic truth which it carries into the life-blood of the Indian people."[1]

As stated in the colophon of every chapter, the Yoga is based on Brahmavidyā, *i.e.* knowledge of the Brahman. And when this is acquired there are two ways in which an enlightened man conducts himself. In III. 3 S'rī Kṛṣṇa says: "In this world a two-fold way of life was taught of yore by me, the path of Sāṃkhya or Jñāna-Yoga for men of contemplation and the path of Yoga, *i.e*, Karma-Yoga, the path of selfless action for men of works." Both are equally worthy of leading one to the supreme goal of Self-Realisation. It is only the simple that makes a distinction between the two. 'He who is firmly set on one', definitely says S'rī Kṛṣṇa in V. 4, 'reaches the end of both'. A Jñāna-yogin is no doubt not compelled to work, since he has realised his pure nature which is beyond all work and duty. 'The man who rejoices in the spirit, who is content and satisfied with spirit alone—he has nothing for which he should work'. He has nothing to gain by the things he has done or left undone in this world, nor has he to depend on any created beings for any object of his (III. 17 & 18). On this account one should not argue that a Jñāna-yogin is precluded from all actions. Jñāna-yogins like Janaka spent their time in worldly activities according to their own dharma, whereas sages like S'uka led the lives of mendicants. But in III. 25 S'rī Kṛṣṇa says that "as ignorant men

[1] *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. I, p. 431.

act from attachment to their work O Arjuna, so too should an enlightened man act but without attachment, so that he may maintain the order of the world', for says He, 'though there is nothing in the three worlds for me to achieve nor is there anything to gain which I have not gained, yet I continue to work'. The enlightened man should always set a model for the less enlightened. Knowledge gives us a sure basis of morality which is equality or *samatva* and the two paths are only the progressive stages in reaching the Supreme End. A Karma-Yogin arrives at it by the conquest of Mamakāra and a Jñāna-yogin by the conquest of Ahankāra. It is only when a man rises above these two conceits that he becomes perfect. The doctrine 'Love thy neighbour as thyself' is well explained in the Gītā. In XIII. 28 it is said that he who has seen the Supreme Lord present alike everywhere, he does not injure his true self by the self and thus he reaches the Supreme State. 'This is the sum and tenor of all morality and this is the standpoint of a man knowing himself as Brahman'.[1] Sages look upon all alike whether it be a cow or a lowly Brahman, a dog or an outcaste, all with unbounded love. Knowledge furnishes one with a good criterion to distinguish between right and wrong. Whatever tends to the good of the world is right and whatever tends to selfish desire is wrong. S'rī Kṛṣṇa does not say that there are two worlds, a practical and a religious, separate from each other. Life is one and undivided and the truths of both philosophy and religion are to be realised in leading the life of active service and not by taking refuge in a jungle from the toils of life. As Rangacharya says, 'The moral power of unselfishness through living the life of disinterested duty is a necessary preparation for the adoption of the bolder life of renunciation and realisation even by those

[1] Paul Deussen, *Philosophy of Vedāntd.*

possessed by Him, whereby through the medium of Prakṛti and its guṇas that He veils his real being from all save from those who pierce through this disguise. Though in reality He is unborn and is eternal, it is by His own power of delusion (Ātma-Māyā) governing Prakṛti that He manifests Himself again and again (IV. 6). Only the wicked carried away by this divine spell consisting in the three guṇas of Nature (VIII. 14, 15) do not know the Truth. Work is the order of Nature and every one is driven to act in spite of himself (III. 5) by the impulse of Nature. " All work is really done by the dispositions of Nature, but man deluded by the feeling of self thinks 'I am the doer'. But he who knows the truth of the dispositions and actions and what is distinct from them, O Arjuna, holds himself aloof thinking, 'it is the organs of sense that are occupied with the objects of sense.' Individuals are different because of their embodiments. As the Mahābhārata says: " A man bound up with guṇas is a Jivātmā or individual soul; when freed from them, he is Paramātmā or Supreme Soul " Chapters IV, XVIII and XIV develop the Guṇa idea completely. All the three Guṇas of Prakṛti, 'goodness', 'passion' and 'dullness', tend to bind down the immortal soul in the body, though of the three 'goodness' or the sattva quality is the best. S'rī Kṛṣṇa asks Arjuna to rise above the three guṇas and attain to the state of a guṇātīta. For, 'when a man dwells in his mind on the objects of sense, he feels an attachment for them. Attachment gives rise to desire and desire breeds anger. From anger comes delusion, from delusion the loss of recollection, from the loss of recollection understanding is ruined and when understanding is ruined a man perishes'. But a man of disciplined mind who moves among the objects of sense with his senses under control and free from love and hatred, attains

to a clear vision (II. 62-64). Such a man remains the same amidst pleasant and unpleasant circumstances and looks upon a clod, a stone and a piece of gold as of equal worth (XV.5-25).

Thus action as such is harmless and all the miseries come from the saṅga (attachment) to the work done by the three qualities of Nature. This attachment is the dullness. The moment this idea is formed man loses sight of his work. So the Gītā says, the best way to practise non-attachment is to renounce the fruit of work. 'Miserable are they who work for fruit (Ch. II. 40). So never work for fruit nor yet desist from work (II. 47), 'Giving up attachment to the fruit of work, always satisfied and depending on none he is ever engaged in work and yet he does no work at all' (IV. 20). Inaction when it is prompted by desire or motivated is really negative action. The chief point is the attitude of non-attachment by which acting or non-acting, one does not become the agent and is not bound (IV. 22). He does what he should do as duty and refrains from any action that is desire-born. This doctrine of action without attachment contains all the essentials of ethics. But this has led to some mistaken notions among the Westerners. This doctrine of non-attachment, it is said, leaves no room for the psychological inducement or incentive to action; it reduces man to a mere automaton, acting as he does without any feelings and is a convenient loophole for the commission of any crime. Absence of personal attachment does not mean that an end or aim is absent. Attachment to the fruit of Action is forbidden in the Gītā, so that one may avoid Karma-bandha. Action without motive is impossible even for a madman, for he too has some fancied motive of his own. The Gītā idea of work without attachment is clear from the following two verses (XVIII. 25) where it is said that actions undertaken through

ignorance without regard to consequences and to one's capacity are born of dullness, whereas (XVIII. 23) an action which is obligatory and done without attachment is said to be born of goodness. "Regardless of the fruit of Action" means nothing but that 'holy indifference' on which St. Francis is never tired of insisting.[1] The Karma-Yoga of the Gītā asks us to have the best of motives, the highest of feelings and always to engage in such work which will bring about the gratest amount of good to the greatest number, while it costs the least trouble to one-self or to others. That there is an end like loka-saṅgraha aimed at without personal attachment is clearly brought out by S'rī Kṛṣṇa's exposition of His own part in the world scheme. Work without attachment is meant for brave souls who can work for the good of the world without expecting any reward and forgetting individual loss or gain. The Gītā wants the petty little self of our mortal life to make room for the universal self, the Immortal Ātman that shines in all and which is the foundation of their very being. 'Always work' says S'rī Kṛṣṇa—never-ceasing selfless work. A mind of equanimity can always think rightly, determine rightly and choose rightly. Therefore strive for yoga. 'Yoga is skill in action' (II. 50). Intelligent good work is the out-come of this balance of mind. Thus the Gītā does not support any heinous crimes or propound a philosophy of inactivity.

No less than five principles of conduct underlie the doctrine of Karma-Yoga in the Gītā. Equanimity of mind is the first principle of conduct. "It is love and hatred born out of contact with sense-objects that gives rise to

[1] Aldous Huxley's Introduction to Gitā translation by Swami Prabhava-nanda, p. 19.

pleasure and pain" (III. 34). Therefore one should try to dissociate oneself from all passions and attain to a calm, serene attitude. Such a man should always act not through fear of punishment or reward but cheerfully, for 'to be doing good and loving good is the highest blessedness'. In III. 9 S'rī Kṛṣṇa says: 'This world is fettered by work unless it is done as a sacrifice'; and in IV, 23 he declares: 'The works of a man whose attachments are gone, who is free, and whose mind is well established in knowledge, melt away entirely, being done as for a sacrifice.' Whatever work is done, charity, penance, sacrifice, etc., must be done with surrender of attachment and of fruits. Self-sacrifice is the second principle of conduct. And this sacrifice depends on the richness of the self that is given. The one idea that pervades throughout the teaching of the Gītā is the killing of narrow selfish desires, the feeling, of Me and Mine. We find mentioned in the Gītā a number of virtues that should be practised by an aspirant, such as sincerity, non-injury, forbearance, self-control, equanimity of heart in pleasure and pain, self-sacrifice and exclusive and faithful devotion to God. Any sin is not an offence against God but a hindrance towards one's progress.

The third principle of conduct is humility. There is a great spiritual danger in thinking that the world is bad and stands in need of our help. God has created the world for a purpose and it is perfectly well adapted to that purpose. We should only think that it is our privilege to work and not that we are slaves to work. Eventually it is one's own self that is benefited by good works. A man inflamed by the sense of service should serve all things that come his way, realising that they are only forms of the Lord and abandoning hatred of all living beings bow everywhere with

humility, with the conviction that the Supreme Spirit exists everywhere from the lowliest of the low to the highest. S'rī Kṛṣṇa lays emphasis on the obligation and not on the right, the only right one has is the right to serve.

The fourth great principle of Karma-yoga is the faithful discharge of one's duty. 'Better is one's own Law though carried out imperfectly. Better is death in going by one's own Law, the Law of another is fraught with fear'. The Gītā in determining one's duty in life says, not only should one have recourse to the S'āstras and be guided by a sense of duty, but one's duty is determined by one's birth and position in life. So one should satisfactorily perform one's Dharma however humble according to the caste in which one is born. The four castes were created by the Lord according to the division of aptitudes and works (IV. 13). This is not all; S'rī Kṛṣṇa determines one's duty according to one's nature also. 'He who does the duty imposed on him by his own nature incurs no sin' (XVIII. 47). So 'Act as thou wilt' (XVIII. 63) says the Lord. The greatness of the Gītā lies here. Though there are numerous treatises which assign duties to invididuals by birth, calling them natural duties and suggesting the advisability of not avoiding the work ordained by nature from birth, there is not one treatise which tells us how to decide between the comparative claims of two conflicting duties.[1] No slavery exists anywhere in this world in the Kingdom of God. The Lord does not compel men to adopt one way or another. He leaves it to the choice of the individual. 'One ought not to give up the work which is suited to one's own nature' (XVIII. 48). Here comes the need to develop one's natural gifts and utilize them in the

[1] Tilak, *Gita Rahasya*, Ch. II, p. 69; Das Gupta, *History of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. I, p. 227.

service of God. Prakṛti is not an evil in the metaphysical sense; so it should not be curbed or suppressed but wisely directed. One should always keep oneself enlightened with the knowledge of the several ways in which the three guṇas of nature work, so that he may not be deceived and attach himself to the works which those qualities of nature prompt. He should transcend them and be free from the pairs of opposites which these guṇas give rise to and should not care for any possessions but the possession of the soul. This is the fifth principle of Karma-yoga.

Thus we see that the Bhagavad Gītā, in the words of Das Gupta, "tries to mark out a middle path between the austere discipline of meditative abstraction on the one hand and the course of duties of sacrificial action . . . in the life of a new type of yogin on the other who should combine in himself the best parts of the two paths devote himself to his duties and yet abstract himself from all selfish motives associated with desires." It is not only pre-eminently ethical but supports it on the surest foundation of Brahma-vidyā. A knowledge of Reality, of oneself as well as of the world is essential to every rational being and this knowledge need not necessarily lead one to a cessation of all activities. What is most important in the life of an enlightened man whom it describes as a *sthita-prajña* is to lead a life of unattached effort and activity, Niṣkāma-Karma. Karma-yoga is freedom in work and not freedom from work.

THE YOGAVĀSIṢṬHA AND THE DOCTRINE OF FREEWILL[1]

BY H. G. NARAHARI, M.A., M.LITT.

THE *Yogavāsiṣṭha* (YV.)[2] is a very popular poem, 'long and diffuse' in extent, theologic and mystic in import. Purāṇic in character, it appears to be rather philosophic in content. Though based on what is believed to be an incident in the life of S'rī Rāma,[3] the real object of the work seems to be to treat, in its own way, of the essentials of Advaita Vedānta. The exact date of the work is still uncertain. Winternitz[4] thinks that the YV. might have been composed by a contemporary of S'aṅkara, since the latter does not mention the work (*Da S'aṅkara das Werk noch nicht erwähnt, ist es vielleicht von einem seiner Zeitgenossen verfasst*). Mr. Sivaprasada Bhattacharya[5] would consider the period between the tenth and the twelfth cent. A.D. as the probable date of the work. Dr. Surendranath Dasgupta[6] is inclined to consider the author of

[1] This paper was prepared by me as Research Fellow in the Sanskrit Department of the Madras University. It was subsequently read at XX Session of the Indian Philosophical Congress, Trivandrum, December 1945.

[2] The book is also called by such other names as *Ārṣarāmāyaṇa*, *Jñānavāsiṣṭha*, *Mahārāmāyaṇa*, *Vāsiṣṭharāmāyaṇa*, or mere *Vāsiṣṭha* (cf. Winternitz, *Geschichte der indischen Litteratur*, III. 443 n.; B. L. Atreya, *Philosophy of the Yogavāsiṣṭha*, p. 3).

[3] For the story concerning the origin of the work, see Dasgupta, *History of Indian Philosophy*, 1932, II. 228 ff.; B. L. Atreya, *op. cit.*, p. 63 f.

[4] *op. cit.*, p. 444.

[5] *Proceedings of III All-India Oriental Conference*, 1924, p. 554.

[6] *op. cit.*, p. 231.

the YV. as 'probably a contemporary of Gauḍapāda or S'aṅkara, about A.D. 800 or a century anterior to them,' while the great enthusiasm of Dr. B. L. Atreya[1] makes him place the 'probable date of the work before Bhartṛhari and after Kālidāsa.' In the view of Mr. P. C. Divanji[2], the earliest date that can be assigned to our work is the second quarter of the tenth century A.D. Farquhar[3] looks upon the YV. as 'one of many Sanskrit poems written in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries,' but it is to be regretted that he assigns no reason whatever for holding such a view. And the arguments advanced by the remaining writers in support of their conclusions are quite open to question. It seems to me quite unsafe to hold anything beyond the fact that the work should have been composed before Jalhaṇa (A.D. 1258)[4] who, in his *Sūktimuktāvalī*, cites verses[5] from the YV.

The object of this paper is to consider the attitude of the YV. towards the well-worn ethical theme, the problem of Freewill, the problem of how far man's activities in this world are already pre-determined or influenced from without by external agencies, and how far he can himself be the architect of his own Fate, the maker of his own Destiny.

The problem of human freedom is sometimes called a purely verbal conflict, and something which 'turns merely upon words and ambiguous expressions' to which 'a few

[1] *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[2] *Proceedings of VII All-India Oriental Conference*, 1933, p. 27.

[3] *Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, p. 228.

[4] cf. V. Raghavan, *Journal of Oriental Research, Madras*, XIII. 128; I cannot be as bold as Dr. Raghavan to hold also that the YV. has borrowed from the *Kāvyamīmāṁsa* and the *Viḍdhasālabhañjikā* of Rājas'ekhara (A.D. 880-920). The problem of borrowing is usually a very complicated one, and views advanced in this direction are often dispensed with as based on subjective speculations.

[5] See pp. 412, 417, 439, 448 and 451 (*Gaekwad Oriental Series*, No. LXXXII, 1938); cf. V. Raghavan, *loc. cit.*.

intelligible definitions would immediately have put an end."[1] While those that oppose Freewill do so with a desire to conserve the effects of good actions done already,[2] those that champion it desire thereby to give a ground of hope to those who feel the burden of the past.[3]

The problem of freedom centres around only the moral nature of man. It is essentially "a philosophical and theological question, not a question of physics or empirical psychology."[4] A freedom from co-action or compulsion cannot fully satisfy the moral craving of man. For, under normal conditions, this is but a common privilege of every human being. Only under exceptional circumstances can this natural privilege be denied. It may then be either impaired by disease, or limited by inadequacy of material, or even taken away by compulsion, but otherwise it is a common human possession.[5] As a modern scientist has said, "Man has freedom—not unlimited freedom but freedom, nevertheless—because he is an individual. His individuality, his self-consciousness, has not been easily won."

Nor would there be justice in the view which holds that freedom is nothing more than the action and reaction between character and environment; for character is partly inherited and partly acquired, and the acquired character is the inevitable product of the inherited one.

The entire problem, therefore, resolves into this: whether, after "admitting the prevalence of habit, the power of inherited character, and the force of circumstances,"[6] we can determine if "the consciousness that things could have been

[1] Hume, Philosophical Works, Vol. IV., *Liberty and Necessity*, cited by Donald Mackenzie, *ERE.*, VI. 124.
[2] T. H. Green, *Prologomena to Ethics*, Oxford, 1890, pp. 128 ff.
[3] William James, *Pragmatism*, p. 120.
[4] Donald Mackenzie, *loc. cit.*
[5] *Ibid.*

otherwise—that evil might be abolished, that responsibility is a fact, that punishment is not a fiction—is possible of vindication on any *Weltanschauung* that can gain the respect of the reason."[1]

Freedom, therefore, means neither mere caprice, nor the absence of all self-determination. "To be controlled by extraneous factors in what one does is not to be a free agent, but to be determined by one-self is the very essence of autonomy."[2] When, therefore, the point is raised whether the doctrine of Karma allows freedom of action, all that is meant is "whether it does or does not preclude self-determination."

In so far as the attitude of the YV. is concerned as regards this problem, it may be stated at the very outset that it is the most uncompromising champion of self-determination known to Indian literature. Descartes was content with believing that the human will was endowed with "absolute power of self-determination, and that all evil and all error can be avoided by withholding our consent by a sheer act of will".[3] The YV. goes a step further and maintains that, even to achieve anything in this world or in the kingdom of heaven, it is only individual effort that is solely responsible (*sarvaṁ eva iha hi sadā saṁsāre . . . samyak prayuktāt sarveṇa pauruṣāt samavāpyate*).[4] Fate is nothing else but the inevitable consequences of our own deeds in the past (*prāk svakarmetarākāraṁ daivaṁ nāma na vidyate*), and its influence is easily curbed by present effort, even as a youth can conquer a child.[5] Of the two factors, past and present, which influence man's activities in this world, the present is

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 125.
[2] M. Hiriyanna, *Aryan Path*. 1935, p. 24.
[3] Abraham Wolf, *Encyclopaedia Brittanica*, XIV Edn., 1929, p. 750.
[4] *Yogavāsiṣṭha* (Nirnayasagara Press Edn., Bombay, 1911), II. 4. 8.
[5] *Ibid.*, II. 6. 4.

superior to the past (*prāktano'dyatanenāsu puruṣārthena jīyate*)[1] and the latter is effortlessly brought down in the struggle between the two.

As already mentioned above, the whole book of the YV. is believed to form the reply of Vasiṣṭha to the queries put to him by S'rī Rāma. The story goes that S'rī Rāma who, after the completion of his studies, went on a tour visiting holy places, returned melancholy and dejected. When asked for the reason, S'rī Rāma is said to have spoken[2] in the presence of Vasiṣṭha, most pessimistically on the vanity of human existence in this world. What happiness can be found in this life, asks Rāma, where men are born to die and are dead only to be reborn? Everything is impermanent (*asthira*) in the world. All existent things (*bhāvāḥ*) are really unconnected (*parasparam asaṅginaḥ*), and it is only our mental imagination (*manaḥ kalpanā*) that associates them with one another. This world where we think we enjoy is purely a fabrication of our own mind the reality of whose existence even is questionable. Our pleasures in this world are all imaginary, and we are as much deluded by them as are the deer who run enthusiastically towards the mirage in search of water. Our desires are never known to be fully satiated. We fulfil one of them only to be impelled by another. The very physical body which is necessary to us for our enjoyment is beladen with disease and suffering. Childhood is a waste, for then we are weak and devoid of wisdom; and old age marks the destruction of all our bodily faculties. Youth is, no doubt, charming, but it is not only fleeting and momentary but leads to bitterness at the end. During this short period, we are caught in the snares of women and, however happy we may

[1] *Ibid.*, II. 4. 17.
[2] *Ibid.*, I. 12 ff.

think we are then, we realize very soon that we have lost both health and happiness. Life is an illusion, and existence a mere mockery. Our very enjoyments are the cause of our pain, our very desires and ambitions of our own destruction.[1]

Vasiṣṭha then begins, in reply, his discourse on the illusoriness of the world and on the need of acquiring the right knowledge concerning the self which only can bring us that real happiness after which we all hanker. In the realization of this happiness the sole determining factor is one's own personal endeavour. This should be well-advanced, with proper zeal and under expert direction. That the mind becomes cool and happy as through the influence of the moon, as a result of meritorious acts, is a happening which is due only to human effort (*pauruṣa*), not to anything else.[2] For achieving anything in this world what is necessary is human effort, properly used;[3] and this effort (*pauruṣa*) consists in the adequate movement of the mind and limbs, in accordance with the direction of the wise man (*sādhūpadiṣṭamārgeṇa yanmanoṅgaviceṣṭitaṁ tat pauruṣam*).[4]

It is only this that succeeds, and any other alternative is mad to choose. The effort must go on till the object is achieved. There is no use in adopting half-way measures, or in turning away from difficulties on the way. Even the great gods owe their success to their own endeavour:[5]

[1] cf. Shelley who, in his *Ode to a Skylark*, says:

"We look before and after;
We pine for what is not;
Our sincerest laughter
With some pain is fraught
Our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought."

[2] *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, II. 4.9.

[3] *Ibid.*, II. 4. 8.

[4] *Ibid.*, II. 4. 11.

[5] *Ibid.*, II. 4. 12-16.

यो यमर्थं प्रार्थयते तदर्थं चेहते क्रमात् ।
अवश्यं स तमाप्नोति न चेदर्धान्निवर्तते ॥
पौरुषेण प्रयत्नेन त्रैलोक्यैश्वर्यसुन्दराम् ।
कश्चित्प्राणिविशेषो हि शक्रतां समुपागतः ॥
पौरुषेणैव यत्नेन सहसाम्भोरुहास्पदम् ।
कश्चिदेव चिदुल्लासो ब्रह्मतामधितिष्ठति ॥
सारेण पुरुषार्थेन स्वेनैव गरुडध्वजः ।
कश्चिदेव पुमानेव पुरुषोत्तमतां गतः ॥
पौरुषेणैव यत्नेन ललनावलिताकृतिः ।
शरीरी कश्चिदेवेह गतश्चन्द्रार्धचूडताम ॥

There are two kinds of effort (*pauruṣa*), ancient (*prāktana*) and current (*aihika*) ; and, of these two, the latter conquers the former which is induced by the store of deeds performed in previous lives (*sañcitakarma*). By persistent endeavour, even mountains can be torn by people who are intelligent and enthusiastic ; what of human endeavour prompted by previous deeds ?[1]

प्राक्तनं चैहिकं चेति द्विविधं विद्धि पौरुषम ।
प्राक्तनोऽद्यतनेनाशु पुरुषार्थेन जीयते ॥
यत्नवद्भिर्दृढाभ्यासैः प्रज्ञोत्साहसमन्वितैः ।
मेरवोऽपि निगीर्यन्ते कैव प्राक् पौरुषे कथा ॥

For human effort to be successful, it must be properly directed. To rush headlong indiscriminately, is to court tragic disaster. We are thus asked to look for the scriptures (*śāstra*) for guidance in such matters. They it is that can point out the right occasion and, acting accordingly, our desires can be achieved. Otherwise misfortune will stare at us in our face :[2]

[1] *Ibid.*, II. 4. 17-18.
[2] *Ibid.*, II. 4. 19 ; 5. 4.

शास्त्रनियन्त्रितपौरुषपरमा पुरुषस्य पुरुषता या स्यात् ।
अभिमतफलभरसिद्ध्यै भवति हि सैवान्यथात्वनर्थाय ॥
उच्छास्त्रं शास्त्रितं चेति द्विविधं पौरुषं स्मृतम् ।
तत्रोच्छास्त्रमनर्थाय परमार्थाय शास्त्रितम् ॥

It is not enough if one starts aright. He must also have the grit to hold on against opposition, and carry out his will. For ever must the idea be stifled, with all the force at our command, that we are mere puppets at the hands of our ante-natal tendencies (*prāktana pauruṣa*) whose promptings we carry out even against our will. In reality these tendencies can never be more powerful than our present effort; in the struggle between the two, the former are easily destroyed by the latter, even as the disease of yesterday is cured by the application of medicine today. It is necessary to contemplate daily on what is expedient at present, and to take up to those good practices which will effect release from the shackles of the cycle of birth and death. Shaking of all laziness, one must put forth efforts towards the attainment of both the worlds, of both heaven (*svarga*) and liberation (*apavarga*). Out of the cave of existence the individual must force himself out, as does the lion from the cage laid down by its enemies. Personal introspection is desirable, and what is found in one in common with the beasts must be shaken off, and only that which befits good men retained. It is the height of folly to lead a purely sensuous life and glory in it. It is as despicable as the life of a germ in a wound:[1]

परं पौरुषमाश्रित्य दन्तैर्दन्तान्विचूर्णयन् ।
शुभेनाशुभमुद्युक्तं प्राक्तनं पौरुषं जयेत् ॥
प्राक्तनः पुरुषार्थोऽसौ मां नियोजयतीति धीः ।

[1] *Ibid.*, II. 5. 9-17.

बलादधस्पदीकार्या प्रत्यक्षादधिका न सा ॥
तावत्तावत्प्रयत्नेन यतितव्यं सुपौरुषम् ।
प्राक्तनं पौरुषं यावदशुभं शाम्यति स्वयम् ॥
दोषः शाम्यत्यसन्देहं प्राक्तनोऽद्यतनैर्गुणैः ।
दृष्टान्तोऽत्र ह्यस्तनस्य दोषस्याद्य गुणैः क्षयः ॥
असद्दैवमधः कृत्वा नित्यमुद्रिक्तया धिया ।
संसारोत्तरणं भूत्यै यतेताधातुमात्मनि ॥
न गन्तव्यमनुद्योगैः साम्यं पुरुषगर्दभैः ।
उद्योगस्तु यथा शास्त्रं लोकद्वितयसिद्धये ॥
संसारकुहरादस्मान्निर्गन्तव्यं स्वयं बलात् ।
पौरुषं यत्नमाश्रित्य हरिणेवारिपञ्जरात् ॥
प्रत्यहं प्रत्यवेक्षेत देहं नश्वरमात्मनः ।
सन्त्यजेत्पशुभिस्तुल्यं श्रयेत्सत्पुरुषोचितम् ॥
किञ्चित्कान्तान्नपानादिकलिलं कोमलं गृहे ।
व्रणे कीट इवासाद्य वयः कार्यं न भस्मसात् ॥

Good or bad results come from our own endeavours, and there is really no such thing as destiny (*daiva*). He that would reject what is visible to his eye and would indulge in uncertain inferences, is the very sort of man who would mistake his own arms for serpents and fly around in panic. Seeing the face of those idiots who are firmly convinced of the supremacy of the Unseen (*adṛṣṭa*) and who believe that they are only directed by Fate (*daiva*), the goddess of Fortune only flies away. Discrimination is therefore necessary, and in order to learn it, one must resort to scriptures and good company. By such an act one's desires are accomplished. Our ignorance is the cause of all our misfortune. It is only through lassitude that this wide earth is full of bestial and

impecunious men; otherwise, every one would be munificent and renowned. Entering into the company of good people, one must attempt to find out the good and bad in himself and learn that discriminating intelligence which only can save his soul. It is idle to believe in a Destiny apart from one's own deeds in previous lives. It is quite possible to destroy these, even as a youth can conquer a child. Even as the evil deeds of yesterday lose their vicious character by virtuous conduct today, so are the past deeds of man counteracted by present endeavour[1]:

शुभेन पौरुषेणाशु शुभमासाद्यते फलम् ।
अशुभेनाशुभं नित्यं दैवं नाम न किञ्चन ॥
प्रत्यक्षदृष्टमुत्सृज्य योऽनुमानमुपैत्यसौ ।
स्वभुजाभ्यामिमौ सर्पाविति बुद्धया पलायते ॥
दैवं संप्रेरयति मामिति दग्धधियां मुखम् ।
अदृष्टश्रेष्ठदृष्टीनां दृष्ट्वा लक्ष्मीः पलायते ॥
तस्मात्पुरुषयत्नेन विवेकं पूर्णमाश्रयेत् ।
आत्मज्ञानमहार्थानि शास्त्राणि प्रविचारयेत् ॥
आबाल्यादलमभ्यस्तैः शास्त्रसत्सङ्गमादिभिः ।
गुणैः पुरुषयत्नेन स्वार्थः संप्राप्यते यतः ॥
इति प्रत्यक्षतो दृष्टमनुभूतं श्रुतं कृतम् ।
दैवोत्थमिति मन्यन्ते ये हतास्ते कुबुद्धयः ॥
आलस्यं यदि न भवेज्जगत्यनर्थः को न स्याद्बहुधनिको बहुश्रुतो वा ।
आलस्यादियमवनिः ससागरान्ता सम्पूर्णा नरपशुभिश्च निर्धनैश्च ॥
बाल्ये गतेऽविरतकल्पितकेलिलोले दोर्दण्डमण्डितवयः प्रभृति प्रयत्नात् ।
सत्सङ्गमैः पदपदार्थविशुद्धबुद्धिः कुर्यात्स्वकीयगुणदोषविचारणानि ॥
तस्मात्प्राक् पौरुषं दैवं नान्यत्तत्प्रोज्झ्य दूरतः ।

[1] *Ibid.*, II. 5. 18-21, 28-31; 6. 1, 4, 5.

साधुसङ्गमसच्छास्त्रैः जीवमुत्तारयेद्बलात ॥
प्राक् स्वकर्मेतराकारं दैवं नाम न विद्यते ।
बालः प्रबलपुंसेव तज्जेतुमिह शक्यते ॥
ह्यस्तनो दुष्ट आचार आचारेणाद्य चारुणा ।
यथाशु शुभतां याति प्राक्तनं कर्म तत्तथा ॥

It is only the lowly, the uncultured and the foolish who keep themselves engrossed in sensual pleasures, who adore Fate (*daiva*) and make no attempt to conquer it. Everything in this world depends upon place, time, action, and object; he who strives much, will succeed without fail Therefore effort must be put forth, intelligence must be purified through the study of scriptures as well as contact with the learned, and this will help the crossing of the ocean of *saṁsāra*. In the forest of man, two fruit-bearing trees have grown up, the previous effort of man and his current effort; and of these two, the stronger prevails over the weaker. He who is engrossed in the absurd misconception that the individual is only compelled to act by an external agent, really ignores the visible. He is an idiot and must always be kept at a distance. By observing the duty prescribed by the scriptures (*śāstra*) one obtains benefit, even as gems are got from the ocean. He that would achieve his desires must be prepared to endeavour continuously and without break. That will lead him to the highest object (*paramārtha*), the goal of all our scriptures, the attainment of which brings endless and uneven enjoyment. Fate is only the invention of the fool. Lost in the fancy of Fate, he ignores human effort which is before him handy and visible. By such hatred of the self, by such idolatry of Fate which ultimately results in inaction man loses his morality (*dharma*), his wealth (*artha*) and his desires (*kāma*). Hence is it that all the

scriptures decree that, with effort, the mind must be deviated from the course of evil it follows and directed towards the path of good so that thereby the individual may achieve all his desires and enjoy happiness. It is the enjoyer that gets satisfaction, not he that does not enjoy ; he moves who has movement, not he that does not move ; and it is the orator that speaks, not he that is incapable of speech ; fruitful, therefore, is the endeavour of men. Even as a man endeavours, so does he enjoy its fruit ; never is an idler known to achieve anything. Man must strive hard that he may not be called either a tree or a serpent. If Fate is the maker of man, why should one act at all ? Fate, by itself, can look to all human activities like bathing and giving sitting and speaking. Everything is therefore obtained by means of human endeavour, not by any other means. The sage Vis'vāmitra knew this ; he ignored Fate and, by dint of his own personal effort, became a brahmin ; he had recourse to no other method :[1]

तज्जयाय यतन्ते ये न लोभलवलम्पटाः ।
ते मूढाः प्राकृताः दीनाः स्थिता दैवपरायणाः ॥
देशकालक्रियाद्रव्यवशतो विस्फुरन्त्यमी ।
सर्व एव जगद्भावा जयत्यधिकयत्नवान् ॥
तस्मात्पौरुषमाश्रित्य सच्छास्त्रैः सत्समागमैः ।
प्रज्ञाममलतां नीत्वा संसाराम्बुनिधिं तर ॥
प्राक्तनश्चैहिकश्चेमौ पुरुषार्थौ फलद्रुमौ ।
सञ्जातौ पुरुषारण्ये जयत्यभ्यधिकस्तयोः ॥
कश्चिन्मां प्रेरयत्येवं इत्यनर्थकुकल्पने ।
यः स्थितो दृष्टमुत्सृज्य त्याज्योऽसौ दूरतोऽधमः ॥
यथाशास्त्रमनुच्छिन्नां मर्यादां स्वामनुज्झतः ।

[1] *Ibid.*, II. 6. 6, 23-25, 29, 31, 32. 34, 36-38 ; 7. 3, 12, 17, 19, 32 ; 8. 6, 20.

उपतिष्ठन्ति सर्वाणि रत्नान्यम्बुनिधाविव ॥
स्वार्थप्रापककार्यैकप्रयत्नपरता बुधैः ।
प्रोक्ता पौरुषशब्देन सा सिद्ध्यै शास्त्रयन्त्रिता ॥
अनन्तं समतानन्दं परमार्थं विदुर्बुधाः ।
स येभ्यः प्राप्यते नित्यं ते सेव्याः शास्त्रसाधवः ॥

. . . . . .

मूढैः प्रकल्पितं दैवं मन्यन्ते ये क्षयं गताः ।
नित्यं स्वपौरुषादेव लोकद्वयहितं भवेत् ॥

. . . . . .

करामलकवद्दृष्टं पौरुषादेव तत्फलम् ।
मूढः प्रत्यक्षमुत्सृज्य दैवमोहे निमज्जति ॥
ये समुद्योगमुत्सृज्य स्थिता दैवपरायणाः ।
ते धर्ममर्थं कामं च नाशयन्त्यात्मविद्विषः ॥
अशुभेषु समाविष्टं शुभेष्वेवावतारयेत् ।
प्रयत्नाच्चित्तमित्येष सर्वशास्त्रार्थसङ्ग्रहः ॥
भोक्ता तृप्यति नाभोक्ता गन्ता गच्छति नागतिः ।
वक्ता वक्ति न चावक्ता पौरुषं सफलं नृणाम् ॥
यो यो यथा प्रयतते स स तत्तत्फलैकभाक् ।
न तु तूष्णीं स्थितेनेह केन चित्प्राप्यते फलम् ॥
जगति पुरुषकारकारणेऽस्मिन् कुरु रघुनाथ चिरं तथा प्रयत्नम् ।
व्रजसि तरुसरीसृपाभिधानां सुभग यथा न दशामशङ्क एव ॥
दैवमेवेह चेत्कर्तृ पुंसः किमिव चेष्टया ।
स्नानदानासनोच्चारान्दैवमेव करिष्यति ॥
विश्वामित्रेण मुनिना दैवमुत्सृज्य दूरतः ।
पौरुषेणैव संप्राप्तं ब्राह्मण्यं राम नान्यथा ॥

Influencing each individual there is a two-fold circle of reminiscent impressions (*vāsanā*) ; and, of these two, the

circle of previous *vāsanās* is but one. If he is already being carried along on the pure stream of *vāsanā*, following that good course, he is certain to attain to permanent happiness; but if a vile instinct leads him to peril, no effort must be spared by him to suppress with force this instinct of the past. The river of *vāsanā* runs on a double course, the course of good and the course of evil. It is human endeavour that should restrict it to the former course only. The mind, already engrossed in evil intents, must be directed aright even with force. It is a beast which requires force to keep it under control. But the process of bringing the mind under discipline should be slow but not sudden. The mind is even like a child, and should be educated by slow degrees; otherwise its equilibrium may be disturbed. Accompanied by good *vāsanās*, and having succeeded in subjecting the senses to control, it is possible to lead a happy life on earth. If the mind of the individual is imperfect or if he is steeped in ignorance, he must follow the dictates of his teacher, the scriptures (*s'āstra*) and the means of valid knowledge (*pramāṇa*). That is the way to become the perfect man, to attain to the state of the concentrated decoction of *Vijñāna* when the whole stream of *vāsanā*, however good, is altogether abandoned:[1]

द्विविधो वासनाव्यूहः शुभश्चैवाशुभश्च ते ।
प्राक्तनो विद्यते राम द्वयोरेकतरोऽथ वा ॥
वासनौघेन शुद्धेन तत्र चेदद्य नीयसे ।
तत्क्रमेण शुभेनैव पदं प्राप्स्यसि शाश्वतम् ॥
अथ चेदशुभो भावस्त्वां योजयति सङ्कटे ।
प्राक्तनस्तदसौ यत्नाज्जेतव्यो भवता बलात् ॥

[1] *Ibid.*, II. 9. 25-27, 30-33, 40-42.

शुभाशुभाभ्यां मार्गाभ्यां वहन्ती वासनासरित् ।
पौरुषेण प्रयत्नेन योजनीया शुभे पथि ॥
अशुभेषु समाविष्टं शुभेष्वेवावतारय ।
स्वं मनः पुरुषार्थेन बलेन बलिनां वर ॥
अशुभाच्चालितं याति शुभं तस्मादपीतरम् ।
जन्तोश्चित्तं तु शिशुवत्तस्मात्तच्चालयेद्बलात् ॥
समता सान्त्वनेनाशु न द्रागिति शनैः शनैः ।
पौरुषेणैव यत्नेन पालयेच्चित्तबालकम् ॥
शुभवासनया युक्तस्तदत्र भव भूतये ।
परं पौरुषमाश्रित्य विजित्येन्द्रियपञ्चकम् ॥
अव्युत्पन्नमना यावद्भवानज्ञाततत्पदः ।
गुरुशास्त्रप्रमाणैस्तु निर्णीतं तावदाचर ॥
ततः पक्वकषायेण नूनं विज्ञातवस्तुना ।
शुभोऽप्यसौ त्वया त्याज्यो वासनौघो निराधिना ॥

The YV. is thus perhaps the most powerful advocate of human freedom ever met with in Indian literature. It lays down the very refreshing and encouraging doctrine that a man's volition (*prayatna*), his real and adequate effort (*pauruṣa*), is invincible in power. There is nothing under the sun which these two cannot accomplish. No doubt, during their operation, they often do come into conflict with the individual's antenatal tendencies (*prārabdha karma*) ; but we are asked to understand that man has in himself the power to fight this his Destiny, to transcend its unhealthy influence, and even to take up to those prescribed practices which will lead him to the *summum bonum* of mundane existence.

ANANTABHAṬṬA

By K. Madhava Krishna Sarma

UNDER the orders of Maharaja Anup Singhji of Bikaner *Anantabhaṭṭa*, son of *Mīmāṁsaka Dādūbhaṭṭa*, wrote two works, namely, the *Tīrtharatnākara* and the ***Advaitaratnākara***.

TĪRTHARATNĀKARA

This is a voluminuous compilation on the *Tīrthas*, based on the various *Purāṇas* and the *Tristhalīsetu*. It contains nearly 38,000 *Granthas*, and is perhaps the largest work on the subject, amply bearing out the author's acquaintance with the whole range of *Purāṇic* literature. Besides a complete MS of the work (No. 1822), the Anup Sanskrit Library has MSS of its various sections. No MS. of the work (complete or incomplete) is reported from other collections.

MSS. IN THE ANUP SANSKRIT LIBRARY

A complete MS. (No. 1822). 793 folios. Well written in a medium hand. Old, brittle and damaged.

INCOMPLETE MSS

Gayāmāhātmya—MSS. Nos. 1790 and 1794.
Ayodhyāmāhātmya—Nos. 1791 and 1795.

Prayāgamāhātmya—Nos. 1792, 1800 and 1801.
Jyotirliṅgamahātmya—No. 1793.
Mathurāmāhātmya—Nos. 1796—97.
Kāśīmāhātmya—Nos. 1790, 1806, 1811 and 1815.
Gaṅgāmāhātmya—Nos. 1799, 1802, 1808 and 1813.
Jīvacchrāddhaprayoga—No. 1803.
Kurukṣetraprayoga—No. 1804.
Kubjāmrakamāhātmya—No. 1805.
Sakalatīrthamāhātmya—No. 1807.
Lohārgalamāhātmya—No. 1809.
Goniṣkramaṇamāhātmya—No. 1810.
Kokāmukhamāhātmya—No. 1812.
Naimiśāraṇyamāhātmya—No. 1814.
Rāmopākhyāna (with Vārāṇasīmāhātmya)—No. 1816.
Ṣaṣṭitīrthanirūpaṇa—No. 1817.
Uttaragokarṇamāhātmya—No. 1820.
Nos. 1818—19 are also incomplete, the end missing.

M.M. Prof. P. V. Kane in his History of *Dharmaśāstrā*, I, 554. gives *Anantabhaṭṭa's* father's name as *Yadu bhaṭṭa*, but in the MSS of his works in the Anup Sanskrit Library it appears as *Dādū bhaṭṭa*. On p. 679, *ibid*, Prof. Kane mentions one *Anantabhaṭṭa*, son of *Dā-ī bhaṭṭa*, author of *Sadācārarahasya*, composed at the desire of *Saṁgrāma Siṁha* (about 1715 A.D.). We are tempted to identify this *Dā-ī* with *Dādū* and this *Ananta* with our author; but there is no evidence for this.

The work begins:

श्रीगणेशाय नमः ।

यः स्मृतो विघ्नपूगघ्नः पूजितः पुरुषार्थदः ।
तं नौमि परमानन्दं गणेशं भक्तवत्सलम् ॥

श्रीरायसिंह: प्रथित: पृथिव्यां श्री शूरसिंहस्तु तदात्मजोऽभूत् ।
तस्मादभूच्छत्रुगणप्रमाथी श्रीकर्णसिंहोऽतिबलो मनस्वी ॥
तस्मादभूच्छ्रीमदनूपसिंहो यो वै नराणामभयप्रदाता ।
दानप्रवीण: सुरशत्रुहन्ता विद्वज्जनौघै: परिसेव्यमान: ॥
यत्कीर्तिमाकर्णयतो नरस्य तापत्रयाधिर्न भवेत्कदाचित ।
तस्याज्ञया सर्वपुराणसारं दृष्ट्वा तथान्यानपि सन्निबन्धान् ॥
मीमांसाशास्त्रपारीणदादूभट्टस्य सूनुना ।
आकरस्तीर्थरत्नानां क्रियतेऽनन्तशर्मणा ॥

Ends :

(कृतो) ग्रन्थस्त्वनन्तेन तीर्थरत्नाकराभिध: ।
ढुण्ढिराजस्त्वनेनाशु प्रीयतां मङ्गलप्रद: ॥
अष्टादशपुराणानि त्रिस्थलीसेतुमेव च ।
दृष्ट्वा यथाशक्ति मया रचितस्तीर्थसंग्रह: ॥
आज्ञयानूपसिंहस्य समाश्रितकृपानिधे: ।
अङ्गीकार्य: स विद्वद्भि: क्षाम्यद्भिर्मम कौतुकम् ॥

इति श्रीमन्महाराजाधिराजश्रीमन्महाराजानूपसिंहदेवस्याज्ञया मीमांसाशास्त्रपारीणदादूभट्टसूनुना अनन्तभट्टेन विरचिते तीर्थरत्नाकरे सकलतीर्थमाहात्म्यनिरूपणं नाम कल्लोल: । श्रीगणेश: प्रसन्नोऽस्तु ।

THE ADVAITARATNĀKARA

In this admirable work which encourages mutual tolerance of various sects, Anantabhaṭṭa has collected passages bearing on the *Advaita* of *Viṣṇu* and *S'iva* from the *Mahābhārata*, *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Purāṇas*, and interpreted them accordingly. There is a MS. of this in the Anup Sanskrit Library (No. 8873). It is old and has 76 sheets of well written *Devanāgarī*, the first two being somewhat damaged.

There are 11 lines per page and 36 syllables per line. The title *Advaitaratnākara* is written above the folio-number in the left-hand margin of the reverse of each folio. There are some marginal corrections. The name of the patron is mentioned both at the beginning and end.

Begins:

श्रीगणेशाय नमः ।

ब्रह्मादयः सुरगणा यन्नत्या हतविघ्नकाः ।
कार्यसिद्धिं परामापुस्तं नमामि गजाननम् ॥

इह खलु तत्तत्पुराणैकदेशपर्यालोचनया दुरभिमानेन च शिवस्य विष्णोश्च परस्परमुत्कर्षमपकर्षं वा वदन्तः केचन पण्डितंमन्याः स्वमिवान्यानपि प्रतारयन्तो दृश्यन्ते । अतस्तेषामज्ञाननिरासपूर्वकं समस्तजनानामुद्धाराय सकलकलाचातुरीनिष्णातस्योद्दामदानविजितसकलरिपुवृन्दस्य नित्यं दानाम्बुधारानिःसृतजलपूरेण दूरीकृतदारिद्र्यदावानलस्य श्रीमन्महाराजाधिराजश्रीमहाराजानूपसिंहप्रभुवर्यस्याज्ञया मीमांसाशास्त्रपारीणदादूभट्टसूनुना अनन्तभट्टेन सकलपुराणतात्पर्यं पर्यालोच्य अद्वैतरत्नाकराख्यो ग्रन्थ आरभ्यते । तत्र केचन शैवाः शिव एव सर्वोत्कृष्ट इतरे गुणभूता इति प्रतिपादयन्ति । तथाहि महाभारते द्रोणपर्वणि जयद्रथवधे संजय उवाच ।

Ends:

नामभेदेन भिद्यन्ते भिद्यन्ते नात्मना स्वयम् ।
इत्यादिवचनैरभेदस्यावगमात्तत्रैव सर्वपुराणतात्पर्यमित्यलं बहुना ॥
अद्वैतविषये योऽयं पुराणवचसां कृतः ।
संग्रहस्तेन मे नाथः प्रीयतां विघ्नपुंगहा ॥

इति श्रीमहाराजाधिराजश्रीमहाराजानूपसिंहदेवस्याज्ञया मीमांसाशास्त्रपारीणदादूभट्टसूनुना अनन्तभट्टेन विरचिते अद्वैतरत्नाकरे अद्वैतनिर्णयः संपूर्णः । शुभं भवतु । मङ्गलमूर्तये गणपतये नमः । सर्वविघ्नविनाशिने नमः ।

LET US HONOUR THE GREAT

1. Sir William Jones Bi-centenary

THE Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal celebrated the Bi-centenary of the birthday of its founder, Sir William Jones, for a week from the 6th of January. He came at a time when the foundations of Indian civilization were getting shaky ; and if Indians have now realized the greatness of their ancient civilization, and if such greatness is being recognized in other countries also, it is in no small measure due to the work done by such noble scholars. The Adyar Library has sent the following message for the occasion :

> It is with great pleasure that, on behalf of the Adyar Library, I send very hearty greetings on the occasion of the celebrations of the Bicentenary of Sir William Jones, who founded the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.
>
> The Adyar Library joins in paying homage to that great scholar who has laid the foundation of modern Orientology, and every institution and every individual dedicated to the cause of oriental studies owes a great debt of gratitude to him.
>
> The relation of such a soul with India will compensate for some unhappy relations between

Europe and India in political and commercial spheres. The latter will be forgotten by the future, while the services of people like Sir William will ever be remembered by posterity for centuries and millenia.

May the function be a big success which it well deserves to be.

G. SRINIVASAMURTI
Hon. Director

2. OUR EDITOR HONOURED

Among the scholars recently honoured by the late Maharaja of Cochin is Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, Editor of this Bulletin and Curator of the Eastern Section of the Library. The title conferred on him is *Gaveshakatilaka*, "ornament of Research scholars," and as its insignia a diploma (*sanad*) and a gold medal were presented to him. Dr. Kunhan Raja's services to Research are manifold; and, so far as the Adyar Library is concerned, his aid for the last twenty years in connection with its literary activities has been invaluable. I take this opportunity, not only to express my grateful appreciation of his valuable co-operation, but also to offer him my very warm felicitations on this well-deserved honour which has been conferred on him. We do hope this will be a forerunner of many more that are yet to come.

G. SRINIVASAMURTI
Hon. Director

MANUSCRIPTS NOTES

THE SATPADYAMUKTĀVALĪ OF MUKUNDAPAṆḌITA

BY H. G. NARAHARI, M.A., M.LITT.

TO the category of a Sanskrit anthology, to the species of compilations whose aim is to assemble together what is admirable in Sanskrit poetry, belongs the *Satpadyamuktāvalī* of Mukundapaṇḍita. A large number of works of this category are known, and a great many of these are available in print. In so far as the present work is concerned, the only[1] MS. I know of is deposited in the Adyar Library with the shelf-number XL. C. 36. It is a fairly old paper MS., written in Devanagari, and consists of 124 folia. Size, 9″ × 3.7″. Lines, 8 in a page. One folio[2] is missing, and a good many of those that survive are considerably damaged by the attack of insects and worms. The MS. must have been copied on Saturday, the twelfth day in the bright-half of the month of S'rāvaṇa in Saṁvat 1853 (= A. D. 1796). The work concludes:

समाप्तोयं ग्रंथः । संव १८५३ श्रावणशुद्धद्वादशीसनवासरे ।

The work seems to have been compiled in Benares:

सत्पद्यमुक्तावल्या(ख्यः) सुभाषितसुसंग्रहः ।
मुकुंदपंडितेना(यं) काश्यां संतुष्टये कृतः ॥

[1] Aufrecht (*CC.* I. 728*a*; III. 150*a*) speaks of *two* MSS. of a *Subhāṣitasaṅgraha*. From the brief descriptions of these which are now available to me, I feel that these two MSS. have nothing to do with our present work.

[2] Fol. 124.

Towards the bottom of the codex, there is an inscription across in a different hand, larger in size than that used while copying the MS., which runs: *pustakam idaṁ anantadevasya*. It is probable that the original owner of this codex was *Anantadeva*.

In *six* chapters each of which is called a *pariccheda*, and in about a thousand verses in all, the work deals with the usual topics which are the concern of a Sanskrit Anthology. I give below a brief description of its contents:

प्रथमपरिच्छेदे

1.	नमस्कृतिः	Fol. 1
2.	आशिषः	1-7
3.	सुभाषितप्रशंसा	7-8
4.	कविप्रशंसा	9-11
5.	पण्डितप्रशंसा	11
6.	सज्जनप्रशंसा	11-13
7.	मनस्विप्रशंसा	13
8.	उदारप्रशंसा	13-14
9.	तेजस्विप्रशंसा	14
10.	गुणप्रशंसा	14
11.	सन्तोषप्रशंसा	14
12.	सत्सङ्गप्रशंसा	14-15
13.	लक्ष्मीप्रशंसा	15-16
14.	प्रवासप्रशंसा	16
15.	सत्पुत्रप्रशंसा	16

द्वितीयपरिच्छेदे

1.	कुकविनिन्दा	16-17
2.	दुर्जननिन्दा	17-20
3.	मूर्खनिन्दा	20
4.	कृपणनिन्दा	20-21
5.	असत्सङ्गतिः	22
6.	याचकनिन्दा	22-23
7.	कापुरुषः	23
8.	सेवानिन्दा	23
9.	दैवम्	23-24
10.	उद्यमः	24
11.	सच्छास्त्रम्	24-25

तृतीयपरिच्छेदे अन्योक्तयः

1.	सूर्यः	25
2.	चन्द्रः	25-26
3.	मेघः	26-29
4.	वायुः	29
5.	हंसः	29-30
6.	मयूरः	30
7.	शुकः	30-31
8.	कोकिलः	31-32
9.	भ्रमरः	32-34
10.	चातकः	34-35
11.	बकः	35
12.	काकः	35
13.	सिंहः	35-36
14.	गजः	36-38
15.	मृगः	38

In the recent *Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit MSS.*[1] in the Library, the present work is referred to as *Subhāṣitasaṅgraha*; but its real name seems to be *Satpadyamuktāvalī*,[2] while the other title refers to its nature as a collectanea of good utterances. The author, *Mukundapaṇḍita*, is the son of *Timmājīpaṇḍita* of *Puṇyastambha*, a village situated on the banks of the *Godāvarī*. All this information follows from the verses at the beginning of the work and from its colophons:

गौरीलोचनचन्द्रिकातनुभृतां कारुण्यकल्लोलिनी
दुःखध्वान्तयुगान्तसौरपटलीविश्वेन्द्रजालौषधीः ।
गुञ्जद्विष्णुविरिञ्चिमुख्यदिविषद्रोलम्बपद्माटवी
माया कापि पुनातु कौतुककरी दैगम्बरी नः सदा ॥

[1] P. 147*a*.

[2] This is evidenced, not only by the verses both at the beginning as well as at the end of the work, but also by the inscriptions on top of the left hand corner of each folio.

नत्वा साम्बसदाशिवाङ्घ्रियुगलं निर्मूलनं संस्मृते:
पुण्यस्तम्भजुषा मुकुन्दविदुषा लीलावशात्काचन ।
श्रीमत्त्र्यम्बकपण्डितात्मजनुषा सत्पद्यमुक्तावली
मात्सर्योज्झितविन्दुवृन्दहृदयानन्दाय सङ्गृह्यते ॥

. . . .

इति श्रीमद्गोदावरिसरालङ्कारीभूतपुण्यस्तम्भस्थिततिमार्जापण्डितात्मज - मुकुन्दपण्डि(तकृ)ते सुभाषितसङ्ग्रहे प्रशंसापरिच्छेद: प्रथम: ॥[1]

इति श्रीमद्गोदावरी . . . . ।[2]

इति श्रीमद्गोदावरीपरि:सरालंकारीभूत . . . . . . मुकुन्दपण्डितकृते संग्रहे अन्योक्तिपरिच्छेदस्तृतीय: ।[3]

इति . . . . . . सुभाषितसंग्रहे राजवर्णनपरिच्छेदश्चतुर्थ: ।[4]

इति . . . . शृङ्गारपरिच्छेद: पञ्चम: ।[5]

सत्पद्यमुक्तावल्याख्यो सुभाषितसुसङ्ग्रह: ।
मुकुन्दपण्डितेनायं काश्यां सन्तुष्टये कृत: ॥

इति . . . . सुभाषितसङ्ग्रहे प्रकीर्णको नाम सत्पद्यमुक्तावलीषष्ठपरिच्छेद: । समाप्तोयं ग्रन्थ: ।[6]

The *Satpadyamuktāvalī* has a large number of verses in common with anthologies like the *Sūktimuktāvalī*, the *Subhāṣitāvalī* and the *Sārṅgadharapaddhati* whose names are quite familiar; but our compiler is mentioned in none of these anthologies. It is possible that this is a late anthology, drawing freely from earlier works of its class, but much more evidence than is yet available is necessary before this statement can be put in the form of a

[1] *Fol.* 16*b*.
[2] *Fol.* 24*b*; the rest of the colophon is almost completely eaten away by worms.
[3] *Fol.* 48*b*.
[4] *Fol.* 66*a*.
[5] *Fol.* 103*b*.
[6] *Fol.* 126*b*.

definite assertion. The very close connection between the V section of this anthology with the *śṛṅgāra* section[1] in the very popular *Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra* is interesting. The latter, being very recent, is more likely the borrower, or there must have been a common source for it and our anthology.

Verses borrowed from other anthologies apart, there are a good many verses in the *Satpadyamuktāvalī*, not traceable in other compilations, which are endowed with considerable poetic excellence. I cite a sample:[2]

प्रातः पङ्कजकुड्मलद्युतिपदं तत्केसरोल्लासवा-
नर्थोऽप्यन्तरसौरभप्रतिनिभं व्यङ्ग्यं चमत्कारि यत् ।
द्वित्रैर्यद्रसिकैश्चिरं सहृदयैर्भृङ्गै(रि)वास्वाद्यते
तत्काव्यं न पुनः प्रमत्तकुकवेर्यत्किञ्चिदुज्जल्पितम् ॥

The value of an anthology rests not so much on its originality as on the literary merit of its content; and, in so far as this test is concerned, the *Satpadyamuktāvalī* can bear it, I think, with considerable credit.

---

[1] Pp. 262 ff.
[2] *Fol. 7b.*

S'ĀSTRADĪPIKĀVYĀKHYĀ : PRABHĀMAṆḌALA

BY V. KRISHNAMACHARYA

THERE are two different commentaries with the title Prabhāmaṇḍala on the *S'āstradīpikā* of Pārthasārathimis'ra written by two different authors *namely* Yajñanārāyaṇa and Anubhavānanda. The former was the disciple of Yajnes'vara while the latter of Kṛṣṇānandās'rama. Yajñanārāyaṇa was also called Yajnes'vara in some of his works. Though these two commentaries bear the same title of *Prabhāmaṇḍala* they are found to be distinct from each other. Both of them have not yet been represented by printed editions and remain only in manuscript. Of these two, Yajñanārāyaṇa's commentary is somewhat familiar to the scholars, and copies of it are often mentioned in the catalogues of MSS., while Anubhavānanda's is not mentioned in Aufrecht's *Catalogus Catalogorum* and is practically unknown to most of the scholars. Thus the copy of the latter is very rare and important. As far as I know only two manuscripts are available for the work each containing different portions. The Curator's office Library, Trivandrum, has a paper MS. containing portions of the fist two adhyāyas.[1] The Tanjore Mahārāja's Library has a palm-leaf MS. containing a fragment of the 3rd adhyāya.[2] The Adyar Library also has a paper MS. but it is only a transcript made from the Tanjore MS. said above.[3] As the MSS. of the Trivandrum and Tanjore Libraries contain only different portions not found in each other and as the MS. of the Adyar Library is only a transcript of the

[1] No. 453 of the *Des. Cat.* of the Curator's office, Trivandrum.
[2] No. 6932 of the *Des. Cat.* of the Tanjore Library.
[3] MS. No. X-I-9[3] of the Adyar Library.

Tanjore MS., practically only one copy is available for the first three adhyāyas of the work.

Both the authors *viz.* Yajñarārāyaṇa and Anubhavānanda seem to have lived more or less in the same period of the 17th century A.D. the former being junior and the latter senior.

1. Yajñanārāyaṇa *alias* Yajñes'vara was the author of the following works:

(1) *S'āstradīpikāvyākhyā* : *Prabhāmaṇḍala.*[1]
(2) *Alaṁkārarāghava.*[2]
(3) *Pañcapādikāvivaraṇojjīvanī.*[3]
(4) *Alaṁkārasūryodaya.*[4]
(5) *S'āstracūḍamaṇi.*[5]
(6) *Aṣṭabhāṣārāmāyaṇa.*[5]
(7) *Campūratna.*[6]
(8) *Saṁgītarāghava.*[5]

In the *Prabhāmaṇḍala* he gives his lineage as following:

[1] *Vide* No. 6930, Vol. XII of the *Des. Cat.* of the Tanjore Library.
[2] ,, No. R. 3927 of the *Trie. Cat.* of the Madras Govt. Orie. Library.
[3] ,, No. R. 592 ,, ,,
[4] ,, No. 5140, Vol. IX. of the *Des. Cat.* of the Tanjore Library.
[5] Quoted in his *Alaṁkārarāghava* on pages 10 and 178 of the MS. No. 39-I, 14 of the Adyar Library.
[6] *Vide* No. 6930, Vol. XII of the *Des. Cat.* of the Tanjore Library.

" वन्देऽस्मत्प्रपितामहं तिरुमलश्रीयज्वराजं तथा
यज्ञेशं च पितामहं स्वपितरं श्रीकोण्डुभट्टारकम् ।
तच्छिष्यानुजनिं पितृव्यतिलकं श्रीलक्ष्मणार्यं गुरुं
ज्येष्ठं श्रेष्ठगुणान्वितं तिरुमलाख्यानं वरं यज्वनाम् ॥
कदलिकपोतमहेशप्रीतिपरिप्राप्तभारतीश्रीकान् ।
श्रीचरकूरिकुलेन्दूनन्यानपि नौमि पुरुषधौरेयान् ॥
सुत्वेह गौतमाम्बातनयोऽलंकारनाटकादिकर: ।
वेदान्तशब्दतर्कग्रन्थकृदाभाति जगति यज्ञेश: ॥"

" इति श्रीसकलपण्डितमण्डलाखण्डलचरकूरिकोण्डुभट्टोपाध्यायतनयेन पितामहश्रीयज्ञेश्वर-भट्टोपाध्यायशिष्येण काश्यपगोत्रबह्वृचाग्रेसरेण तिरुमलयज्वप्रियसहोदरेण गङ्गाम्बिकेयेन श्रीयज्ञनारायणदीक्षितेन विरचिते शास्त्रदीपिकाव्याख्याने प्रभामण्डलाख्याने प्रथमस्याध्यायस्य चतुर्थ: पाद: ॥"

Tirumalayajvan of the Carakūri family was the foremost member; his son was Yajñes'vara; his sons were Koṇḍubhaṭṭa and Lakṣmaṇa; Koṇḍubhaṭṭa's sons were Tirumalayajvan and Yajñanārāyaṇa (the author). From this it is clear that Tirumalayajvan I was his greatgrandfather; Yajñes'vara was the gandfather; Koṇḍubhaṭṭa was the father; Lakṣmaṇa was the paternal uncle; Tirumalayajvan II was the elder brother. He also states that he was the disciple of Yajñes'vara, (his grandfather) and his paternal uncle Lakṣmaṇa was the disciple of Koṇḍubhaṭṭa.

Lakṣmaṇa our author's paternal uncle was also called Lakṣmīdhara and the following are among the works written by him;

(1) *Ṣaḍbhāṣācandrikā.*[1]
(2) *Prasannarāghavavyākhyā : Timmabhūpālīyā.*[2]
(3) *Gītagovindavyākhyā : S'rutirañjanī.*[3]
(4) *Anargharāghavavyākhyā : Iṣṭārthakalpavallī.*[4]

In the *Ṣaḍbhāṣācandrikā* Lakṣmaṇa gives the same genealogy as given by Yajñanārāyaṇa in his Prabhāmaṇḍala. In the *Prasannarāghavavyākhyā* also he gives the same genealogy and dedicates the work to Timmarāja, the sister's son of Tirumalarāja (1580 A.D). In the *Gītagovindavyākhyā* also he gives the same genealogy and dedicates the work to Tirumalarāja (1580 A.D.) In the *Anargharāghavavyākhyā* after giving the same genealogy as given in his other works, he adds that after leading a domestic life for a long time he became a saṁnyāsin with the name Rāmānanda under the preceptor called Kṛṣṇānandayati the author of the *Siddhāntasiddhāñjana.*[5]

[1] Printed and published by K. P. Trivedi, Poona.

[2] *Vide* R. No. 2338 of the Trie. Cat. of the Madras Govt. Orie. Library.

[3] *Vide* No. 22, page 202 of Seshagiri Sastri's Report No. 2 and D. No. 11962 of the Des. Cat. of the Madras Govt. Orie. Library.

[4] Printed in Telugu Character at Mysore.

[5] *Vide* the introductory verses :

"अस्त्यन्ध्रदेशे चरकूरिवंशः कृष्णातटे काश्यपगोत्ररूढः ।
यो बह्वृचानां बहु माननीयो धत्ते सदा कीर्तिसुवैजयन्तीम् ॥

Kṛṣṇāśrama mentioned in the Colophon of the work as his *guru* is none but Kṛṣṇānandayati the author of the *Siddhānta-siddhāñjana* as evidenced by the following verse:

" सौम्याब्दे मृगभास्करे दिनमणाविन्दोः कलां पञ्चमीं
पुष्णत्यञ्चितपौष्णभे रविदिने लग्ने शुभंयावपि ।
कृष्णानन्दगुरुप्रसादमहितस्तद्ध्यानधन्याशयो
रामानन्दयतिः स्वयं लिखितवान् सिद्धान्तसिद्धाञ्जनम् ॥ "

(Vide the Introduction to the *Siddhāntasiddhāñjana*, Tri. Sans. Series XLVII).

In this verse Rāmānanda describes himseif as a disciple of Kṛṣṇānandaguru, evidently theauth or of the *Siddhāntasiddhāñjana*.

In the verse mentioned above, Rāmānanda describes himself also as the scribe of a MS. of the *Siddhāntasiddhāñjana* and

तत्रोदभूत्तिम्मयसोमयाजी बुधोऽष्टभाषाकविपट्टभद्रः ।
नित्यान्नदाता निजभक्तिलब्धवृषाकपायीरमणप्रसादः ॥
तस्मादुदैद्बह्वृचचक्रवर्ती यज्ञेश्वरः पण्डितसार्वभौमः ।
सर्वाम्बिका सर्वगुणोपपन्ना तस्य द्वितीयाभवदम्बिकाभा ॥
तस्मादुदभवन् पुत्राश्चत्वारः श्रीनिकेतनाः ।
विधिमन्त्रार्थवादज्ञाश्चत्वारो निगमा इव ॥
षड्दर्शनीतत्त्वविवेककर्ता स्वशिष्यसंपादितदिग्जयश्रीः ।
तेष्वादिमः पण्डितपट्टभद्रः श्रीकोण्डुभट्टो जयतीह लोके ॥
लक्ष्मीधरस्तदनुजो दक्षिणामूर्तिकिंकरः ।
सर्वविद्वत्कविमतो जयति क्ष्मातले सुधीः ॥
स गार्हस्थ्ये चिरं स्थित्वा जित्वा सर्वदिशः सुधीः ।
संन्यस्याजनि योगीन्द्रो रामानन्दाश्रमाभिधः ॥
स करोति महायोगी मीमांसाद्वयपारगः ।
अनर्घराघवव्याख्यां प्रीतये विदुषां शुभाम् ॥

Colophon:

इति श्रीपरमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्यकृष्णाश्रमपादशिष्यरामानन्दविरचितायामनर्घराघवव्याख्यायामिष्टार्थकल्पवल्लीसमाख्यायां षष्ठोऽङ्कः ॥ "

gives the date of copying as the Sunday, the 5th day of the bright-fortnight in the Makara month of the year Saumya which corresponds to the 16th of January 1670 A.D. according to the *Indian Ephemeris* by L. D. Swamikannu Pillai.[1] It has been already pointed out that Lakṣmīdhara became Saṁnyāsin after leading a married life for a long time and was called Rāmānanda during the period of his life as an ascetic. Therefore we may take the year 1670 as the later part of his life time. As Yajñanārāyaṇa was the nephew of Rāmānanda we may fix the former in the same period as a junior contemporary of the latter.

II. Anubhavānanda was the the author of the following works:

(1) *S'āstradīpikāvyākhyā : Prabhāmaṇḍala*[2]
(2) *Advaitaratnakos'avyākhyā*[3]

In the works mentioned above he describes himself as a disciple of Kṛṣṇānandapūjyapāda evidently the author of the *Siddhāntasiddhāñjana*.[4] Thus Anubhavānanda is known to have been a co-pupil of Rāmānanda under Kṛṣṇānandapūjyapāda. Therefore Anubhavānanda may be placed more or less in the same period in which Rāmānanda is known to have lived *i.e.*, 1600 to 1680 A.D.

This date is further corroborated by the fact that Bhāskaradīkṣita of Pallakacheri, another disciple of Kṛṣṇānanda and the

[1] *Vide* the Introduction to the *Siddhāntasiddhāñjana*, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. XLVII.

[2] *Vide* No. 453. Vol. III of the *Des. Cat.* of the Curator's Office Library, Trivandrum, No. 6932, Vol. XII of the *Des. Cat.* of the Tanjore Palace Library and MS. No. X. I. 9[3] in the Adyar Library.

[3] *Vide* 7503, Vol. XIII of the *Des. Cat.* of the Tanjore Palace Library.

[4] *Vide* the following Colophons :

"इति श्रीमत्परमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्यश्रीकृष्णानन्दपूज्यपादशिष्यश्रीमदनुभवानन्दविरचिते शास्त्रदीपिकाप्रभामण्डले प्रथमस्याध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः ॥"

"इति श्रीमत्परमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्यश्रीमत्कृष्णानन्दपूज्यपादशिष्यश्रीमदनुभवानन्दविरचिते शास्त्रदीपिकाव्याख्याने प्रभामण्डलाख्याने तृतीयस्याध्यायस्य पञ्चमः पादः ॥"

"इति श्रीमत्परमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्यश्रीमत्कृष्णानन्दपूज्यपादशिष्यश्रीमदनुभवानन्दविरचिते कोशरत्नप्रकाशे प्रथमः परिच्छेदः ॥"

author of a commentary called *Ratnatūlikā*[1] on the *Siddhānta-siddhāñjana* was one of the recipients of Tiruvisanallur grant of the king Sāhaji I who ruled Tanjore from 1684 to 1711 A.D.[2]

Nṛsiṁhasarasvatī was another disciple of Kṛṣṇānandapūjya-pāda and wrote a commentary called Subodhinī on the *Vedāntasāra* of Sadānanda. In this commentary he gives the date of the composition as the year Durmukha in the 16th century of the S'ālivāhana-s'aka corresponding to 1579 S'aka = 1657 A.D.[3]

Thus the four authors *namely* Rāmānanda *alias* Lakṣmaṇa of Carakūri family, Anubhavānanda, Bhāskaradīkṣita and Nṛsiṁha-sarasvatī are known to have been co-pupils under Kṛṣṇānandayati and lived in the 17th century A.D. Yajñanārāyaṇa was their younger contemporary.

---

[1] *Vide* the following verse and colophon of the *Ratnatūlikā*:

" यद्दीक्षाविषयं विनेयनिवहं प्रीत्या भजन्ते स्वयं
लक्ष्मीकीर्तिसरस्वतीधृतिदयाह्रीशान्तिदान्त्यादय: ।
कृष्णानन्दसरस्वतीशगुरुराट् चित्ते मदीये शुभे
नित्यं संनिहितोऽस्त्वसौ मम गुरुर्ध्वान्तापनुत्त्यै विभु: ॥ "

" इति श्रीकृष्णानन्दसरस्वतीगुरुचरणारविन्दपरिचरणलब्धसकलविद्यावैशद्यस्य सर्वतोमुखयाजिनो भास्करदीक्षितस्य कृतौ सिद्धान्तसिद्धाञ्जनव्याख्यायां रत्नतूलिकाख्यायां कर्मविचारप्राथम्यनिरासाञ्जनविवरणं समाप्तम् ॥ "

(No. 344. P. 770. Vol. II of the *Des. Cat.* of the Curator's Office, Trivandrum.)

[2] *Vide* the Introduction to the *Siddhāntasiddhāñjana*, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. XLVII, and pp. 8 and 19 of the pamphlet called Rāma-bhadradikṣita, published in the Kâvyamâlâ Series.

[3] " जाते पञ्चशताधिके दशशते संवत्सराणां पुन:
संजाते शतवत्सरे प्रभुवरश्रीशालिवाहे शके ।
प्राप्ते दुर्मुखवत्सरे शुभशुचौ मासेऽनुमत्यां तिथौ
प्राप्ते भार्गववासरे नरहरिष्टीकां चकारोज्ज्वलाम् ॥

इति श्रीपरमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्यश्रीमत्कृष्णानन्दपूज्यपादशिष्यश्रीनृसिंहसरस्वतीकृता वेदान्तसारटीका सुबोधिन्याख्या समाप्ता ॥ "

(*Vide* p. 78 of the *Vedāntasāra*, edited by Heeralal Dhole, Calcutta 1883.)

OBITUARY NOTICE

T. R. SRINIVASA AIYANGAR, B.A., L.T.

1879—1945

BY A. N. KRISHNA AIYANGAR, M.A., L.T.

ON the 20th of October, 1945, one of the Honorary Editors of the Adyar Library Series, Mr. T. R. Srinivasa Aiyangar, B.A., L.T., passed away. It has become our melancholy duty to record his demise and write a short notice of his life in this *Bulletin*. The late Mr. Srinivasa Aiyangar was born at Tanjore, on 28th May, 1879. His father, Ramaswami Aiyangar, was a clerk in the office of the local District Registrar. At the early age of 13 he lost his father and was brought up under the fostering and devoted care of his mother Janaki Ammal, his paternal and maternal grand-fathers helping the slender resources of the family to cope with the educational expenses of the boy. The sterling qualities which he displayed attracted the attention of the Founder of Kalyanasundaram High School, Tanjore, and ensured a free education for the high school classes. Srinivasan passed the Matriculation Examination in high rank in 1893 and entered the St. Peters' College, Tanjore, as a free scholar, thanks to the kindness of the Principal of that College the late Rev. W. H. Blake.

After graduation, he started life as a private tutor. He subsequently qualified himself for the L. T. and was appointed as

teacher in the Kalyanasundaram High School on 1-2-1904. By honest work, perseverence and intelligent understanding of the requirements of his pupils he rose to the position of being the head of the institution in which he had studied. It is worthy of note that the part played by him in bringing the School from the management of a private individual to a duly constituted Trust Board, registered under Act XXI of 1860, is commendable and shows his far-sightedness. As Headmaster of the Kalyanasundaram High School (1927-31), Correspondent and Secretary to the Board of Trustees, Mr. Srinivasa Aiyangar endeared himself to the public of Tanjore.

While education was the main occupation of Mr. Srinivasa Aiyangar, his part in the public life of Tanjore was equally absorbing. He took a leading part in the organization and spread of the Cooperative movement in Tanjore and the surrounding areas and continued as a member of the managing bodies of these institutions for a long time. The movement represented all its phases such as Banking, Cooperative loans, Stores Department, Agricultural mortgage loans and Building Societies. His great experience was utilized in the reorganization of the controlling Board of the Viraraghava High School, Tanjore, and constituting the Managing Body into a Trust Board duly registered. The flaire for administration which he displayed induced the Sub-ordinate Judge of Tanjore to appoint him as the Resident Trustee for ten years to the Bangaru Kamakshi Amman Devasthanam. In this capacity, he introduced system and order into the administrative machinery of the Devasthanam, revived the ancient practices of the temple where they had fallen into disuse, recovered certain lands belonging to the Devasthanam which otherwise would have been lost to it and renewed some of the important jewels of the Devasthanam.

His connection with the Adyar Library reflects the literary side of his activities. Besides regularly annotating the Sanskrit *classics* prescribed for the University courses, he collaborated with the late Paṇḍit S. Subrahmanya Sastri in publishing the *Varivasyārahasya* of Bhāskara Rāya and was responsible for the English portion of that work. Similar help rendered to Paṇḍit Subrahmanya Sastri, in bringing out the *Yoga Sūtrās* of Patañjali, the *Jīvanmuktiviveka*, the *Ānanda Laharī* and the *Saundarya Laharī* with English translation and Introduction, also resulted in preparing the ground for the major work of the translation of the One Hundred and Eight Upaniṣads which he was to do later. He also wrote an introduction in English to the *Saṃgrahacūḍāmaṇi* edited for the Library by the late Paṇḍit S. Subrahmanya Sastri (1938).

After his retirement in 1931 from the Headmastership of the Kalyanasundaram High School, he was invited to translate into English with the help of the late Paṇḍit S. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, F. T. S., the One Hundred and Eight Upaniṣads edited and published in the Adyar Library Series with the commentary of S'rī Upaniṣad Brahma Yogin, in accordance with that commentary. The result of the joint labours of the two scholars have been published in the years that followed. In 1938 the translation of the *Yoga Upaniṣads* was published. This was followed by the *Sāmānya Vedānta Upaniṣads* in 1941. The *Vaiṣṇava Upaniṣads* was taken up immediately, but the war interfered seriously with the programme of publication of the Library, and one of the books held up was the *Vaiṣṇava Upaniṣads.* The manuscript of the *S'aiva and S'ākta Upaniṣads* is ready. The *Ten Major Upaniṣads* have also been translated by him and the manuscript is ready for publication. These translations constitute his major contribution to Sanskrit literature and learning.

The Library was equally anxious with Mr. Srinivasa Aiyangar to complete the publication of the series of translations which it had planned, and but for the War, would have completed the series. It is a debt which the Library owes to the late Mr. Srinivasa Aiyangar to publish the remaining volumes of the English translations of the Upaniṣads at an early opportunity in recognition of the devoted and zealous services of the translator. I cannot do better than quote the words of the Director of the Adyar Library in estimating the services of Mr. Srinivasa Aiyangar, along with that of the late Paṇḍit Subrahmanya Sastri with whom he was so closely associated :

" It is a great loss to the Adyar Library that both these scholars who placed their great talents at the disposal of the Adyar Library and served as our Honorary Editors till the last day of their lives passed away before this and the future volumes in the series could be published. They undertook work at the Adyar Library purely as a labour of love ; and performed it with rare zeal and devotion. The most valuable service rendered by them to the Adyar Library will never be forgotten, but will always be cherished by their colleagues with warmest affection and profound gratitude." [1]

[1] Preface to the *Vaiṣṇava Upaniṣads*, Adyar Library Series, No. 52.

EDITORIAL

1. ROYAL HONOURS

SOME scholars, poets and literary men were honoured by H.H. the Maharaja of Cochin on the 17th December, 1945 on the occasion of his eightieth birthday by conferring on them suitable Titles and by presenting them with gold medals and Sannads as insignia of the Titles. This is the first time that a ruling member of that ancient royal family has lived up to the eightieth year. This is perhaps the most ancient royal family that has continuously wielded ruling powers over the same territory without a break. And the family can boast of many scholars in ancient times and even now, and they have all been great patrons of arts and letters. His Highness, it is very regrettable to have to record, passed away on the 31st of January, within six weeks after that happy event. The birthday was also the occasion when His Highness made a special grant of one hundred thousand rupees for aiding publications of ancient manuscripts in the State.

2. INDIAN PHILOSOPHICAL CONGRESS

Many Conferences are held annually during the latter part of December, in India. The Indian Philosophical Congress was held at Trivandrum under the auspices of the University of Travancore. The session was opened by H. H. the Maharaja of Travancore on the afternoon of the 19th of December. He referred to the fact that the greatest of thinkers the world has produced according to universal acceptance, namely, S'aṅkarācārya. was born within the territorial limits of the

State. Sachivottama Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar welcomed the Delegates. Prof. M. M. Sharif of the Muslim University, Aligarh was the President. In his presidential address, he surveyed the growth of Muslim thought and dealt with the contribution of Muslims to the thought of the world. The session continued for four days and concluded on the evening of the 22nd December. There was a symposium on "The Philosophical Basis of Marxism" and another on "Is Time Real?" Three Papers were submitted on each of the two subjects by Dr. D. M. Datta, Prof. A. R. Wadia and Prof. Kali Prasad, and by Dr. A. C. Mukerji, Prof. G. R. Malkani and Dr. N. V. Banerjee respectively. The conference was divided into 5 sections, namely (1) Ethics, Social Philosophy, and Religion with 16 Papers, (2) Logic and Metaphysics with 10 Papers, (3) Indian Philosophy with 21 Papers (4) Islamic Philosophy with just 1 Paper and (5) Psychology with 18 Papers. As it ought to be in India, the Indian Philosophy Section is the strongest. As usual, the Library had myself as its Delegate to the Conference and the Paper submitted by me to the Conference is published in this issue. Mr. H. G. Narahari too attended the Conference and his Paper also appears in this issue.

6. INDIAN HISTORY CONGRESS

The eighth session of the Indian History Congress opened at the Annamalai University on the 29th December and lasted for three days. Dr. Tara Chand of Allahabad was the President. The Congress was divided into five sections according to the five periods of Indian history, namely, (1) earliest times up to 711 A.D., (2) 711 to 1206 A.D., (3) 1206 to 1526 A. D., (4) 1526 to 1764 A. D. and (5) 1764 to the present times. Here there were 23 Papers for the 1st section,

8 for the 2nd, 14 for the third, 20 for the fourth and 18 for the fifth. Apart from these five sections, there was a sixth section called the Dravidian section with 21 Papers. In spite of the convenience in such a division, one feels that this differentiation of Dravidian History and Culture as something distinct from the History of India divided into five sections, could have been avoided. The History of India is a unit and there cannot be any sort of separation as Aryan and Dravidian India. There was no event in the "Aryan" India which did not have its influence in the "Dravidian" India also, and no event has taken place in the "Dravidian" India which was not related with the "Aryan" India. The Library appointed Mr. A. N. Krishna Aiyangar as its Delegate at the Conference.

4. Music Conferences

The nineteenth Annual Conference of the Madras Music Academy was held in Madras for ten days from the 22nd of December. The Conference was opened by the Raja of Ramnad. The thirteenth session of the South Indian Music Conference was opened by Justice Rajamannar of the Madras High Court on the evening of the 23rd December. Still another Music Conference was the third annual Music Festival of the Tamil Isai Sangam. The first two Conferences have more or less the same ideals; the third is distinctly a movement for giving due importance to Tamil Music in the art-developments of South India. It is unfortunate that art, which it is really that unites man, should become the occasion for rivalry and even unpleasant animosities. One must notice that the rich music heritage of the Tamil country is not receiving its due recognition in the music world of the day. Although ideal music is only a form, yet language counts much in music;

the theme of the composition and the sounds of the composition count as much in music as the music-form itself, in actual practice.

If art is to be a real force in man's life, there must be in it, as in every aspect of life, an adjustment of "law" and "freedom." Law must be set by artists, and artists must have the freedom to expand the scope of the law of taste. At present, the scope for the artists is restricted within a small field. *Kīrtana* singing, *Rāgālāpana*, *Svara* and *Tāla* demostrations, and *Pallavis* take the entire serious portion of a music programme. It is legitimate that there must be an organised move to lift art from this limitation. Older phases of musical art must be revived and adjusted to modern tastes, and *newer* forms of music must also be evolved. Music compositions too must be selected from a wider field of choice extending beyond recent Telugu and Sanskrit compositions. This reform must be effected without mutual feuds also.

On the 24th of December, Sir S. V. Ramamurti opened an exhibition of paintings in Adyar and he emphasised the spiritual values of art in his address. These activities of the country show that there is real hope for the future of the country by way of an artistic and cultural, and consequently, the true spiritual, awakening in the land. Materialism by way of over-emphasis of political and economic problems, is casting a thick gloom over the country, and it is only the bright rays of art and culture that can dispel this gloom and lead the country into light and wisdom. India once led the nations of the civilized world in the matter of art, culture and wisdom. India should regain its position in these sublimer aspects of life instead of following the West in their political idealogies.

Printed and Published by C. Subbarayudu, at the Vasanta Press, Adyar, Madras
P. I. C. No. 85—11-2-1946

SRI C. JINARĀJADĀSA

Assumed office of the President of the Theosophical Society

on February 17, 1946



श्रीमान्नः कुशलं तनोतु भगवान् सर्वेश्वरः संततं
ब्रह्मज्ञानसमाजसद्‌द्रुमहापङ्क्तिर्विजेजीयताम् ।
जेजीयाज्जिनराजदासविबुधो भक्ताग्रणीर्योऽधुना
दिव्यज्ञानसमाजनायकपदं प्राप्येह राराज्यते ॥

G. SRINIVASA MURTI.

GENIUS

BY H. P. BLAVATSKY

[*Reprinted with acknowledgments to the Editor of "The Theosophist."*]

Genius! thou gift of Heaven, thou light divine!
Amid what dangers art thou doom'd to shine.
Oft will the body's weakness check thy force,
Oft damp thy vigour, and impede thy course;
And trembling nerves compel thee to restrain
Thy nobler efforts to contend with pain;
Or want, sad guest! . . .—CRABBE

AMONG many problems hitherto unsolved in the Mystery of Mind, stands prominent the question of genius. Whence, and what is genius, its *raison d'être*, the causes of its excessive rarity? Is it indeed "a gift of Heaven"? And if so, why such gifts to one, and dullness of intellect, or even idiocy, the doom of another? To regard the appearance of men and women of genius as a mere accident, a prize of blind chance, or, as dependent on physical causes alone, is only thinkable to a materialist. As an author truly says, there remains, then, only this alternative: to agree with the believer in a *personal god* "to refer the appearance of every single individual to a *special act of divine will and creative energy*," or "to recognise, in the whole succession of such individuals, one great act of some will, expressed in an eternal inviolable law."

Genius, as Coleridge defined it, is certainly—to every outward appearance, at least—"the faculty of growth"; yet to the inward intuition of man, it is a question whether it is genius—an abnormal aptitude of mind—that develops and grows,

or the physical brain, *its vehicle*, which becomes through some mysterious process fitter to receive and manifest *from within outwardly* the innate and divine nature of man's over-soul. Perchance, in their unsophisticated wisdom, the philosophers of old were nearer truth than are our modern wiseacres, when they endowed man with a tutelar deity, a Spirit whom they called *genius*. The substance of this entity, to say nothing of its *essence*—observe the distinction, reader,—and the presence of both, manifests itself according to the organism of the person it informs. As Shakespeare says of the genius of great men—what we perceive of his substance "is not here"—

> For what you see is but the smallest part. . .
> But were the whole frame here,
> It is of such a spacious, lofty pitch,
> Your roof were not sufficient to contain it.

This is precisely what the Esoteric philosophy teaches. The flame of genius is lit by no anthropomorphic hand, save that of one's own Spirit. It is the very nature of the Spiritual Entity itself, of our *Ego*, which keeps on weaving new life-woofs into the web of reincarnation on the loom of time, from the beginnings to the ends of the great Life-Cycle. This it is that asserts itself stronger than in the average man, through its personality, so that what we call "the manifestations of genius" in a person, are only the more or less successful efforts of that Ego to assert itself on the outward plane of its objective form—the man of clay—in the matter-of-fact, daily life of the latter. The Egos of a Newton, an Æschylus, or a Shakespeare, are of the same essence and substance as the Egos of a yokel, an ignoramus, a fool, or even an idiot; and the self-assertion of their informing *genii* depends on the physiological and material construction of the physical man. No Ego differs from another Ego, in its primordial or original

essence and nature. That which makes one mortal a great man and of another a vulgar, silly person is, as said, the quality and make-up of the physical shell or casing, and the adequacy or inadequacy of brain and body to transmit and give expression to the light of the real, *Inner* man; and this aptness or inaptness is, in its turn, the result of Karma. Or, to use another simile, physical man is the musical instrument, and the Ego, the performing artist. The potentiality of perfect melody of sound, is in the former—the instrument—and no skill of the latter can awaken a faultless harmony out of a broken or badly made instrument. This harmony depends on the fidelity of transmission, by word or act, to the objective plane, of the unspoken divine thought in the very depths of man's subjective or inner nature. Physical man may—to follow our simile—be a priceless Stradivarius, or a cheap and cracked fiddle, or again a mediocrity between the two, in the hands of the Paganini who ensouls him.

All ancients knew this. But though all had their Mysteries and their Hierophants, not all could be equally taught the great metaphysical doctrine; and while a few elect received such truths at their initiation, the masses were allowed to approach them with the greatest caution and only within the farthest limits of fact. "From the DIVINE ALL proceeded Amun, the Divine Wisdom . . . give it not to the unworthy," says a Book of Hermes. Paul, the "wise *Master-Builder*," (*I Cor.* III 10) but echoes Thoth-Hermes when telling the Corinthians "We speak Wisdom among them that are perfect (the initiated) . . . *divine* Wisdom in a Mystery even the *hidden* Wisdom" (*ibid.* II 7).

Yet, to this day the ancients are accused of blasphemy and fetishism for their "hero-worship." But have the modern historians ever fathomed the cause of such "worship"? We believe not. Otherwise they would be the first to become

aware that that which was "worshipped," or rather that to which honours were rendered was neither the man of clay, nor the *personality* . . . but the divine imprisoned Spirit, the *exiled* "god" *within* that personality. Who, in the profane world, is aware that even the majority of the magistrates (the *Archons* of Athens, mistranslated in the Bible as "Princes") whose official duty it was to prepare the city for such processions, were ignorant of the true significance of the alleged "worship"? Verily was Paul right . . . (*ibid.* V 2).

Were Chapters II and III of the First Corinthians ever translated in the spirit in which they were written—even their dead-letter is now disfigured—the world might receive strange revelations. Among other things it would have a key to many hitherto unexplained rites of ancient Paganism, one of which is the mystery of this same hero-worship. And it would learn that if the streets of the city that honoured one such man, were strewn with roses for the passage of the Hero of the day; if every citizen was called to bow in reverence to him who was so feasted; and if both priest and poet vied in their zeal to immortalise the Hero's name after his death—occult philosophy tells us the reason why this was done.

"Behold," it saith, "in every manifestation of genius—*when combined with virtue*—in the warrior or the bard, the great painter, artist, statesman or man of Science, who soars high above the heads of the vulgar herd, the undeniable presence of the celestial exile, the divine *Ego* whose jailor thou art, O man of matter!" Thus, that which we call *deification* applied to the immortal God within, not to the dead walls or the human tabernacle that contained him. And this was done in tacit and silent recognition of the efforts made by the divine captive who, under the most adverse circumstances of incarnation, still succeeded in manifesting himself.

Occultism, therefore, teaches nothing new in asserting the above philosophical axiom. Enlarging upon the broad metaphysical truism, it only gives it a finishing touch by explaining certain details. It teaches, for instance, that the presence in man of various creative powers—called genius in their collectivity—is due to no blind chance, to no innate qualities through hereditary tendencies—though that which is known as atavism may often intensify these faculties—but to an accumulation of individual antecedent experiences of the Ego in its preceding life, and lives. For, though omniscient in its essence and nature, it still requires experience through its *personalities* of the things of earth, earthy on the objective plane, in order to apply the fruition of that abstract omniscience to them. And, adds our philosophy, the cultivation of certain aptitudes throughout a long series of past incarnations must finally culminate in some one life, in a blooming forth as *genius*, in one or another direction.

Great Genius, therefore, if true and innate, and not merely an abnormal expansion of our human intellect—can never copy or condescend to imitate but will ever be original, *sui generis* in its creative impulses and realisations. Like those gigantic Indian lilies that shoot out from the clefts and fissures of the cloud-nursing and bare rocks on the highest plateaux of the Nilgiri Hills, true Genius needs but an opportunity to spring forth into existence and blossom in the sight of all on the most arid soil, for its stamp is always unmistakable. To use a popular saying, innate genius, like murder, will out sooner or later, and the more it will have been suppressed and hidden, the greater will be the flood of light thrown by the sudden irruption. On the other hand artificial genius, so often confused with the former, and which, in truth, is but the outcome of long studies and training, will

never be more than, so to say, the flame of a lamp burning outside the portal of the fane; it may throw a long trail of light across the road, but it leaves the inside of the building in darkness. And, as every faculty and property in Nature is dual—*i.e.*, each may be made to serve two ends, evil as well as good—so will artificial genius betray itself. Born out of the chaos of terrestrial sensations, of perceptive and retentive faculties, yet of finite memory, it will ever remain the slave of its body; and that body, owing to its unreliability and the natural tendency of matter to confusion, will not fail to lead even the greatest *genius*, so called, back into its own primordial element, which is chaos again, or *evil*, or earth.

Thus between the true and the artificial genius, one born from the light of the immortal Ego, the other from the evanescent will-o'-the-wisp of the terrestrial or purely human intellect and the animal soul, there is a chasm, to be spanned only by him who aspires ever onward; who never loses sight, even when in the depths of matter, of that guiding star the Divine Soul and mind, or what we call *Buddhi-Manas*. The latter does not require, as does the former, cultivation. The words of the poet who asserts that the lamp of the genius—

> If not protected, pruned, and fed with care,
> Soon dies, or runs to waste with fitful glare,

—can apply only to artificial genius, the outcome of culture and of purely intellectual acuteness. It is not the direct light of the *Manasa putra*, the "sons of wisdom," for true genius lit at the flame of our higher nature, or the Ego, cannot die. This is why it is so very rare. Lavater calculated that "the proportion of genius (in general) to the vulgar, is like one to a million; but genius without tyranny, without pretension, that judges the weak with equity, the superior with humanity, and equals with justice, is like one in ten millions." This is indeed

interesting, though not too complimentary to human nature, if, by "genius," Lavater had in mind only the higher sort of human intellect, unfolded by cultivation, "protected, pruned, and fed," and not the genius we speak of. Moreover such genius is always apt to lead to the extremes of weal or woe him through whom this artificial light of the terrestrial mind manifests. Like the good and bad genii of old with whom human genius is made so appropriately to share the name, it takes its helpless possessor by the hand and leads him, one day to the pinnacles of fame, fortune and glory, but to plunge him on the following day into an abyss of shame, despair, often of crime.

But as, according to the great Physiognomist, there is more of the former than of the latter kind of genius in this our world, because, as Occultism teaches us, it is easier for the personality with its acute physical senses and *tatvas* to gravitate toward the lower quaternary than to soar to its triad—modern philosophy, though quite proficient in treating this lower place of genius, knows nothing of its higher spiritual form—the "one in ten millions." Thus it is only natural that confusing one with the other, the best modern writers should have failed to define *true* genius. As a consequence, we continually hear and read a good deal of that which to the Occultist seems quite paradoxical. "Genius requires cultivation," says one; "Genius is vain and self-sufficient," declares another; while a third will go on defining the *divine light* but to dwarf it on the Procrustean bed of his own intellectual narrow-mindedness. He will talk of the great eccentricity of Genius, and allying it as a general rule with an "inflammable constitution," will even show it "a prey to every passion but seldom delicacy of taste!" (Lord Kames). It is useless to argue with such, or tell them that

original and great Genius puts out the most dazzling rays of human intellectuality, as the sun quenches the flame-light of a fire in an open field; that it is never eccentric; though always *sui generis;* and that no man endowed with true genius can ever give way to his physical animal passions. In the view of an humble Occultist, only such a grand altruistic character as that of Buddha or Jesus, and of their few close imitators, can be regarded, in our historical cycle, as fully developed GENIUS.

Hence, true genius has small chance indeed of receiving its due in our age of conventionalities, hypocrisy and time-serving. As the world grows in civilisation, it expands in fierce selfishness, and stones its true prophets and geniuses for the benefit of its apeing shadows. Alone the surging masses of the ignorant millions, the great people's heart, are capable of sensing intuitionally a true "great soul" full of divine love for mankind, of god-like compassion for suffering man. Hence the populace alone is still capable of recognising a genius, as without such qualities no man has a right to the name. No genius can be now found in Church or State, and this is proven on their own admission. It seems a long time since in the thirteenth century the "Angelic Doctor" snubbed Pope Innocent IV who, boasting of the millions got by him from the sale of absolutions and indulgences, remarked to Aquinas that "the age of the Church is past in which she said, 'Silver and gold have I none!' True, was the ready reply; but the age is also past when she could say to a paralytic, 'Rise up and walk.'" And yet from that time, and far, far earlier, to our own day the hourly crucifixion of their ideal Master both by Church and State has never ceased. While every Christian State breaks with its law and customs, with every commandment given in the Sermon on the Mount, the Christian Church justifies and approves of this through

her own Bishops who despairingly proclaim: "A Christian State *impossible* on Christian Principles." Hence—no Christ-like (or Buddha-like) way of life is possible in civilised States.

The Occultist then, to whom "true genius is a synonym of self-existent and infinite mind," mirrored more or less faithfully by man, fails to find in the modern definitions of the term anything approaching correctness. In its turn the esoteric interpretation of Theosophy is sure to be received with derision. The very idea that every man with a "soul" in him, is the vehicle of (a) genius, will appear supremely absurd, even to believers, while the materialist will fall foul of it as a "crass superstition." As to the popular feeling—the only approximately correct one because purely intuitional—it will not be even taken into account. The same elastic and convenient epithet "superstition" will, once more, be made to explain why there never was yet a universally recognised genius—whether of one or the other kind—without a certain amount of weird, fantastic, and often uncanny, tales and legends attaching themselves to so unique a character, dogging and even surviving him. Yet it is the unsophisticated alone, and therefore only the so-called *uneducated* masses, just because of that lack of sophistical reasoning in them, who feel, whenever coming in contact with an abnormal, out-of-the-way character, that there is in him something more than the mere mortal man of flesh and intellectual attributes. And feeling themselves in the presence of that which in the enormous majority is ever hidden, of something incomprehensible to their matter-of-fact minds, they experience the same awe that popular masses felt in days of old when their fancy, often more unerring than cultured reason, created of their heroes gods, teaching:

> . . . the weak to bend, the proud to pray
> To powers unseen and mightier than they.

This is now called Superstition. But what is Superstition? True, we dread that which we cannot clearly explain ourselves. Like children in the dark, we are all of us apt, the educated equally with the ignorant, to people that darkness with phantoms of our own creation; but these "phantoms" prove in no wise that that "darkness"—which is only another term for the *invisible* and the *unseen*—is really empty of any *Presence* save our own. So that if in its exaggerated form, "superstition" is a weird incubus, as a belief in things *above* and *beyond* our physical senses, yet it is also a modest acknowledgment that there are things in the universe, and around us, of which we knew nothing. In this sense "superstition" becomes not an unreasonable feeling of half wonder and half dread, mixed with admiration and reverence, or with fear, according to the dictates of our intuition. And this is far more reasonable than to repeat with the too learned wiseacres that there is nothing "nothing whatever, in that darkness"; nor can there be anything since they, the wiseacres, have failed to discern it.

E pur se muove! Where there is smoke there must be fire; where there is a steamy vapour there must be water. Our claim rests but upon one eternal axiomatic truth: *nihil sine causa.* Genius and undeserved suffering prove an immortal Ego and Reincarnation in our world. As for the rest, *i.e.*, the obloquy and derision with which such theosophical doctrines are met, Fielding—a sort of Genius in his way, too—covered our answer over a century ago. Never did he utter a greater truth than on the day he wrote that "if superstition makes a man a fool, *scepticism makes him mad.*"

OUR PRESIDENT

On the 17th of February this year, C. Jinarajadasa was declared duly elected the President of the Theosophical Society, and he formally assumed charge of that great position the same day. The announcement was made by the Recording Secretary of the Society at a function in the Headquarters Hall at Adyar. That was the day when the anniversary of the death of Col. Olcott, the President-Founder of the Society, was celebrated, and the announcement of the election of the new President was made at the end of the celebration of the anniversary. The President made his first Address also, on the occasion. He is the fourth President of the Theosophical Society. Col. H. S. Olcott, the Founder of the Society, was its life President and died in February, 1907. He was succeeded by Mrs. Annie Besant, who was elected four times consecutively as President of the Society for periods of seven years. She passed away when she was nearly completing her fourth term of office, in September 1933. George S. Arundale was the third President who was elected to the position in June 1934, and on his death last August, the new President was chosen for the place.

He was born at Curuppumullage in Ceylon (which place is indicated by his initial C.) on the 16th of December 1875, exactly three months after the Theosophical

Society was founded. He was first educated at a Buddhist School in Ceylon which later developed into the now famous Ananda College. In 1889 he went over to England, and passing the Matriculation Examination of the London University after receiving private tuition, he joined the St. John's College at Cambridge. He took his M.A. in Cambridge in 1900, with Sanskrit and Pali. In 1902 and 1903, he was in Milan as a student in the Literature and Science Branch of the University of Pavia. From 1904, he has been a worker for the Theosophical Society. He was its Vice-President when Mrs. Besant was President and deputised for the President when she was out of the Headquarters and when later she was disabled.

It is a matter for special pride to those who are connected with the Adyar Library that he was one of its former Directors. And he entertains a particular regard for that position which he occupied, as is evidenced from the message he gave to the Library for publication when the Bulletin was started in 1937. Thus he wrote: "As a past Director of the Library, I ask for the enthusiastic co-operation of all, whether they know Sanskrit or not." He was always interested in the affairs of the Library, and he guided us and councelled us in all matters connected with the activities of the Library. He is a linguist commanding French, Italian, Spanish and Portugese for fluent public speech, besides English. He knows German too. He is a great scholar in Sanskrit and Pali and is very proficient in Greek and Latin. He is a philosopher

and scientist; he is a close student of letters and of arts and an authority on æsthetics. He is an author with a large number of works on religion, philosophy and science to his credit, and he is a good public speaker, clear, specific, comprehensive and convincing in his treatment of the subject. He has travelled in the various countries of the world. He is a man with a variety of interests, and when he interests himself in any subject, he takes pains to understand the subject. His interests are constant and enduring.

He is a Buddhist by birth. He has closely studied all the religions of the world. He knows that Buddhism cannot be studied without the historical background of the earlier phases of Hinduism and that many of the tenets of Buddhism and many of the terms found in Buddhistic texts have a long history behind, without a knowledge of which a true understanding of the religion is impossible. He is a deep student of the *Upaniṣads*; and Plato is his favourite.

While I convey our loyal greetings to the President on behalf of those who are working in the Adyar Library, I must here record my special gratitude to him in so far as it was he who first entertained me in the Library exactly twenty years ago and opened up for me the *Path* to the place where I find myself now.

C. KUNHAN RAJA,

Editor, *Adyar Library Bulletin.*

[1] WAS SOMA AN INTOXICATING DRINK OF THE PEOPLE ?

BY C. KUNHAN RAJA

SOMA is a drink offered to the gods at sacrifices performed by the ancient Aryans. Since it has its counterpart in the Avesta, namely, Haoma, it is certain that the custom of offering Soma to the Gods is not a mere Indian one, but is an Indo-Iranian one. There is no evidence to connect the custom with the whole of the Aryans.

Neither traditional interpretation nor traditional belief associated Soma with an intoxicating drink either in India or among the Parsees. But as soon as modern researches started in Europe in the field of ancient civilizations in the East, it was assumed more or less as a matter of course that Soma is a drink, and as such an intoxicating drink. The word *Mada* associated with the Soma drink was the only evidence, if it is an evidence at all, to relate Soma with intoxication. *Mada* in modern Sanskrit means intoxication, and *Matta* is one who is drunk. The word *Mada* in its various grammatical forms occurs in innumerable places in the *Ṛgveda*, and in most of the places it is related to Soma. But in the *Ṛgveda* the word is associated with the acquisition of anything that is the object of one's strong longing, and

[1] A Paper read at the meeting of the Archaeological Society of South India held on Monday the 28th January, 1946 at the University Buildings.

Mada means only that mental phase which is produced by the acquisition of what is eagerly longed for, like the acquisition of cows, sons, riches etc. There is nothing to show that in *Mada* there is an element of stupefaction of the mind, a loss of control over one's mental steadiness. As against this there is the word *Durmada*, evil *Mada*, which is the effect of alcoholic drink; and this *Durmada* is associated with another drink, namely, *Surā*. Thus in Veda itself what we find is that Soma produced happiness (*Mada*) and *Surā* produced intoxication (*Durmada*.) The presence of the word *Durmada* or evil intoxication along with *Surā*, which is alcohol, and the association of Soma with only happiness or *Mada*, should by themselves be enough to show that Soma was not an intoxicating drink.

If we had been discussing the point in the earlier stages of Oriental Research, perhaps it would have been possible to dismiss the point in a very easy way. But now the belief has become very wide that Soma was an intoxicating drink, and a national drink too, among the Indo-Aryans, and it has become necessary now to disprove the position with positive evidences, instead of leaving it to those who start the theory of its being an intoxicating drink to prove their position. Belief has become their proof for that position. But as a matter of fact the point was never attempted to be *proved*; it was simply taken for granted.

We may assume the position as acceptable that man offers to the various gods what he himself likes. If man offers a drink to a god, that must be a drink which he himself enjoys. Thus when Soma is offered to the gods, it is not unreasonable to assume that Soma was a national drink. And no drink has a right to be a national drink unless it is also an intoxicating drink. Further, Soma is mentioned as

producing *Mada*, and *Mada* means intoxication. Thus we come to the position that Soma was an intoxicating drink among the Indo-Aryans. This is more or less the position of scholars, in regard to this point. Scholars have not ignored the point that at that time there was another drink, which is termed *Surā*, and that *Surā* produced *Durmada* or evil intoxication.

The following are the places in the *Ṛgveda* where there is a reference to *Surā* :

1. युवं नरा स्तुवते पज्रियाय कक्षीवते अरदतं पुरन्धिम् ।
   कारोतराच्छफादश्वस्य वृष्णः शतं कुम्भाँ असिञ्चतं सुरायाः ॥ I-116-7
2. सूर्ये विषमा सजामि दृतिं सुरावतो गृहे ।
   सो चिन्नु न मराति नो वयं मरामारे अस्य योजनं हरिष्ठा मधु त्वा
   मधुलः चकार ॥ I-191-10
3. न स स्वो दक्षो वरुण ध्रुतिः सा सुरा मन्युर्विभीदको अचित्तिः ।
   अस्ति ज्यायान् कनीयस उपारे स्वप्नश्चनेदनृतस्य प्रयोता ॥ VII-86-6
4. हृत्सु पीतासो युध्यन्ते दुर्मदासो न सुरायाम् ।
   ऊधर्न नग्ना जरन्ते ॥ VIII-2-12
5. भोजा जिग्युः सुरभिं योनिमग्रे भोजा जिग्युर्वध्वं या सुवासाः ।
   भोजा जिग्युरन्तः पेयं सुराया भोजा जिग्युर्ये अहूताः प्रयन्ति ॥
   X-107-9

There are many references to *Surā* in the *Atharvaveda*. The following are the references :

1. घृतह्रदा मधुकूलाः सुरोदकाः क्षीरेण पूर्णा उदकेन दध्ना ।
   एतास्त्वा धारा उप यन्तु सर्वाः स्वर्गे लोके मधुमत् पिन्वमाना उप
   त्वा तिष्ठन्तु पुष्करिणीः समन्ताः ॥ IV-34-6

2. गिरावरगराटेषु हिरण्ये गोषु यद्यशः ।
सुरायां सिच्यमानायां कीलाले मधु तन्मयि ॥ VI-69-1

3. यथा मांसं यथा सुरा यथाक्षा अधिदेवने ।
यथा पुंसो वृषण्यत: स्त्रियां निहन्यते मनः ।
एवा ते अघ्न्ये मनोधि वत्से नि हन्यताम् ॥ VI-70-1

4. यद्गिरिषु पर्वतेषु गोष्वश्वेषु यन्मधु ।
सुरायां सिच्यमानायां यत्तत्र मधु तन्मयि ॥ IX-1-18

5. तस्मै घृतं सुरां मध्वन्नमन्नं क्षदामहे ।
स नः पितेव पुत्रेभ्यः श्रेयः श्रेयश्चिकित्सतु भूयो भूयः श्वः श्वो देवेभ्यो मणिरेत्य ॥ X-6-5

6. यच्च वर्चो अक्षेषु सुरायां च यदाहितम् ।
यद्गोष्वश्विना वर्चस्तेनेमां वर्चसावतम् ॥ XIV-1-35

7. येन महानघ्न्या जघनमश्विना येन वा सुरा ।
येनाक्षा अभ्यषिच्यन्त तेनेमां वर्चसावतम् ॥ XIV-1-36

8. स विशोऽनु व्यचलत् । तं सभा च समितिश्च सेना च सुरा चानुव्यचलत् । सभायाश्च वै स समितेश्च सेनायाश्च सुरायाश्च प्रियं धाम भवति य एवं वेद ॥ XV-9-1, 2, 3

9. नकीं रेवन्तं सख्याय विन्दसे पीयन्ति ते सुराश्वः ।
यदा कृणोषि नदनुं समूहस्यादित् पितेव हूयसे ॥ XX-114-2

This occurs in the *Ṛgveda* also as VIII-21-14

10. युवं सुराममश्विना नमुचावासुरे सचा ।
विपिपाना शुभस्पती इन्द्रं कर्मस्वावतम् ॥

पुत्रमिंव पितरांवश्विनोभेन्द्रावथुः काव्यैर्दंसनांभिः ।
यत्सुरामं व्यपिबः शचीभिः सरस्वती त्वा मघवन्नभिष्णक् ॥

XX-125-4, 5

These occur in the *Ṛgveda* also as X-131-4, 5.

There is nothing to show that in those days they considered *Surā* as anything objectionable, that they condemned the use of *Surā*. What we are justified in assuming is that this *Surā* was the national drink of the time.

The question regarding Soma being an intoxicating drink must be approached from within the text itself. If we had only Haoma in the Avesta and if we had to depend entirely on the description of Haoma to settle the point, then the question of Soma being an intoxicating drink might not have arisen at all. There is not even a hint in the whole of the Avesta about Haoma being an intoxicating drink. This gives us the right approach. If we have to start with a hypothesis, that hypothesis should be that Soma was only a sacred drink for the gods.

What this Soma or Haoma is, has not yet been properly settled. There is no doubt that it is a creeper with leaves. It grows on the mountains. In the *Ṛgveda*, Munjavān is given as the name of the mountain on which good Soma grows. We have not been able to identify this mountain.

It is understood that the real Soma is no more available, and that the Soma now used is only another variety. In the *Brāhmaṇas*, there is the prescription of a substitute, when Soma is not available. Here we have to consider one thing. If Soma had been an intoxicating drink, and if Soma had become unobtainable, then what we expect is that the Aryans would have substituted another national drink in its place; and it is definitely known that there was *Surā* which was an

intoxicant and a national drink. But *Surā* is not the prescribed substitute when Soma is not obtainable. Thus the very fact that the substitute prescribed for Soma, when Soma is not obtainable, is not an intoxicating drink, proves that the original Soma too was not an intoxicating drink.

It is not always necessary that what is offered to gods is what man likes for himself and what man enjoys in his own life. In most of the cases it may be so. But there are exceptions. Although various flowers and sandal paste are used by man and are also used for the worship of gods, the leaf of *Tulasī* plant which is extensively used for divine worship is not used by man in his daily life. The leaf of *Tulasī* has a symbolic meaning. Similarly Soma too need not necessarily be a drink of man on the simple ground that it is offered to the gods. There are many other cases like that. Man burns incence at home and also in temples. But among the Hindus, burning camphor is done only in front of the images of gods and is not practised as a domestic luxury. Cases may be multiplied.

Soma is not offered to all the gods. The ancient Indian interpreters have divided the vedic divinities into those who receive the oblation of Soma and those who receive praise (*Havirbhājaḥ* and *Sūktabhājaḥ*). They have also divided the gods according to their position in the heaven (*Dyauḥ*), in the atmospheric region (*Antarikṣa*) and on the earth (*Pṛthivī*). There is some sort of correlation between these two systems of division. The divinities who receive praise are in the heavenly region and those who receive the Soma-oblation are in the two lower regions. This is only in a general way and not absolutely. One also notices two sorts of symbolisms in the Vedas: the Bull (*Vṛṣabha*) symbol for rites (*Karma*) and the Horse (*As'va*) symbol for praise and for wisdom (*Sūkta*

and *Dhī*). Soma is associated with rites or *Karma*. *Karma* destroys *Vṛtra*, and *Stuti* (song or praise) destroys *Vala*. *Karma* is associated with the flow of water and *Stuti* is associated with the flow of light. The light is also symbolised as cows (*Gāvaḥ*).

Thus Soma comes into the system of vedic ritualism in an atmosphere of symbols. There is every reason to assume that Soma itself was symbolic, that its value is symbolic. This is the most important point which I am now engaged in studying. The correlation of the various divisions of the divinities I have just referred to—the gods to whom Soma is offered and the gods to whom praises are offered, the Bull and the Horse and the Cow symbolsims, the *Vṛtra* and the *Vala* paralleism, the water and the light symbolism—all these must be worked out. This approach is sure to lead us to some definite conclusion on the matter.

There is another matter which seems to indicate that Soma was not a drink of the people at large. It is mentioned essentially as a drink of the gods. There is no mention of men drinking Soma. This may be so only at the sacrifices; and at other times it may also be a drink of the men. But we must consider the point of men having become eligible to partake of Soma by acquiring divinity through good deeds. Thus the Ṛbhus were at first men, the sons of Sudhanvān, and they became gods and acquired eligibility to drink Soma at sacrifices through their virtuous deeds. Maruts were also men raised to the status of gods later. Yama was once a man; he was the first to find out the *Path*; he too enjoys Soma, residing and ruling over the other world. Aṅgiras were sages (*Ṛṣis*) who became eligible to drink Soma. Many of these who have departed from this world (*Pitṛs*) also enjoy Soma in the region beyond the earth. Even though the

eligibility stated here is only with reference to the drink of Soma offered at sacrifices, yet this special mention of eligibility for drinking Soma as confined to divinities, even at sacrifices, seems to indicate that Soma was not a national drink.

Before I take up the main argument which I propose to adduce against the theory of Soma being an intoxicating drink, I may say something more about the possible symbolism of Soma. About the gods of the Vedas, there are various theories. Some hold that they are anthropomorphic, that they are personifications of the various phenomena of Nature. Regarding the nature of gods like Savitṛ, Sūrya and Mitra, there can be no doubt that they are aspects of the Sun. Uṣas can be nothing but the Dawn. But there is another theory that the gods must be studied with a mythological background; and in this there is an astronomical bias. According to this view, gods are divided as sun-gods and moon-gods. In the *Ṛgveda* itself, the individuality and the identity of the sun-gods are quite plain and unmistakable. But it is not so easy to identify the moon-gods. It must also be noticed that the various rites are performed only by day time, and that, after the winter months are over when the sun becomes brighter. Thus the religion of the *Ṛgveda* must be accepted as one of Sun-worship. The sun is the source of all light and the source of all life. The moon is definitely stated as receiving lustre from the sun. According to later mythology, the moon is of the form of nectar (*Amṛta*), which is the food of the gods. Gods eat up the parts of the moon and this is the mythological explanation of the phenomenon of the waning moon. Although we have no definite evidence about the specific features of the Soma plant, it is said in later literature that the plant drops its leaves during the

course of the waning moon and puts on leaves during the course of the waxing moon. Thus there is found to be a sort of resemblance between the Soma plant and the moon. This latter-day description of the Soma plant gives us a right to have a hypothesis that the Soma plant was only a symbol of the moon, and that the whole of the Soma sacrifice has a symbolic significance as a moon-rite. Just as the gods receive their light from the Sun, similarly the Soma rite represents how the moon is offered to the gods as their food. The light of the moon is the light of the Sun itself.

Now, when we take up the question of what the Soma itself is, we find that there is nothing to show that it was a national drink among the ancient Aryans of India, and still less are the evidences to show that it was an intoxicating drink. There is practically no hint of man drinking Soma as a luxury and as a source of enjoyment. This complete absence of any reference to man drinking Soma in the Veda may be attributed to Veda being essentially related to the gods, without any reference to man and his social life. But still it is rather surprising that there is not a single place where there is a reference to man also enjoying the drink that is offered to the gods, if that had been a drink of the nation. Man drank Soma after the sacrifice only as *Prasāda*, which gives him some spiritual merit. It gives him immortality; it takes him to the eternal heaven.

We must consider the mode of preparing the Soma for the sacrifice and its relation to the preparation of national drinks. There are descriptions of how Soma is pressed and how it is offered. The creeper along with the leaves is crushed in a mortar with a pestle. Water is added to it. It is pressed and the juice is extracted with the fingers. Then it is allowed to pass through a sieve made of sheep's wool.

After filtering it thus, it is offered to the gods, by pouring it in fire. It is offered either by itself, or it is mixed with water, curdled milk, honey etc. before it is offered to the gods. There are words like *Madhvās'ira* (mixed with honey), *Payaās'ira* (mixed with water), *Dadhyās'ira* (mixed with curdled milk) and *Yavās'ira* (mixed with barley.)

We are not sure how much of juice is produced. Soma used to be bought and taken to the place in a cart. This indicates that a good quantity must have been produced for the sacrifice. The present practice is of little help to us, in settling the point. At present they have only a small stalk, and after mixing it with water and crushing it, they get only a small quantity of juice. If that were the condition in ancient times also, certainly Soma could not have been a national drink.

There is reference to the waves in the vessels in which Soma juice is collected. There is reference to its being like an ocean and of making a terrible noise. From such descriptions, one may conclude that in those days they were using a good quantity of its juice at sacrifices. Since it was offered in the fire, certainly they could not have poured any big quantity as offering, as otherwise the fire would be extinguished. So the natural conclusion is that large quantities must have been left behind at the end of the sacrifices, which the people drank for enjoyment. The Soma is described as entering the belly of Indra and being like an ocean there. There is the description of this Soma which enter the belly of Indra, being like an ocean with waves in it. If only a small portion could have been offered to Indra, since otherwise the fire would be extinguished, and if this small offering of Soma too is described as forming an ocean, we lose much of the value of the description of the Soma juice being like an ocean in the containers after extraction, in determining

the quantity of Soma that was pressed at sacrifice. The poetic descriptions in the Vedas must be taken at their face value. In considering the question whether Soma was drunk by the Aryans in ancient India, we must also take note of the fact that selling Soma was condemned in ancient times; if Soma were a national drink there is no reason why this should be condemned.

The most important point that has to be considered is the question whether Soma juice was allowed to ferment. Is there a process of fermentation in the extraction of the juice and offering it to the gods? I do not think that any scholar has adequately considered this aspect of the problem. There has been no investigation of this point. In the descriptions it is found that Soma was pressed just at the time when it was to be offered, that it was offered to the gods as soon as the juice was extracted. If some vegetable juice is pressed and is offered to the gods immediately, either as it is or mixed with other materials like water, curdled milk, honey and barley, how can we say that what is offered is alcoholic? Every vegetable product must remain for some time before it can ferment, before it can become intoxicating. It is not all vegetable juice that can so ferment. And the question whether Soma juice can ferment and develop alcohol at all, has yet to be considered.

There are two words in the Veda that have to be considered in this connection. There is the word *Ṛjīṣa.* It is interpreted as meaning the remnant of Soma after pressing the juice in the morning, kept till evening for being pressed again. Here are the passages in the commentaries in explanation of the term.

Yāska: ऋजीषी सोमः । यत् सोमस्य पूयमानस्यातिरिच्यते तदृजीषमपार्जितं भवति । V-12

Sāyaṇa: ऋजीषं शत्रूणामपार्जकम् । I-32-6

तृतीयसवने ऋजीषस्याभिषवात् तत्र च मरुतः स्तूयन्ते इति तेषामृजीषित्वम् । यद्वा ऋजीषिणः प्रार्जयितारो रसानाम् । I-87-1

ऋजीषमुदकम् । तद्वन्तः । यद्वा ऋजीषोऽपगतसारः सोमः । II-34-1

सोमवन् । III-43-5

ऋजीष उपार्जितोऽभिषुतः सोमः । VIII-86-4

Skandasvāmin: यत् सोमस्य पूयमानस्यातिरिच्यते तदृजीषम् । माध्यंदिनाभिषुतनिरसीकृतमृजीषम् । तमेव तृतीयसवने हारियोजने च अभिषुणोति । I-32-6

Mādhava: अपार्जकं शत्रूणाम् । I-32-6

The St. Petersburg Dictionary gives the meaning of *Ṛjīṣa* as Soma-Trester. But the meaning of *Ṛjīṣin* (having *Ṛjīṣa*) is given in it as vorstürzend, ereilend. Monier Williams gives the meaning of *Ṛjīṣa* as sediment or residue of Soma; the Soma plant after the juice has been pressed out. And *Ṛjīṣin* too is explained in the same way by him. Grassman gives only one meaning for both the words, namely, vordringend, garade drauf los eilend, in his Wörterbuch. Anyway, the meaning that *Ṛjīṣa* is what is left of the stalk of Soma when the juice is pressed is accepted. And this is the meaning in which the word is understood in *S'rauta* practice even in modern times. The Soma pressed in the morning and kept till evening is even now designated as *Ṛjīṣa*.

The epithet *Ṛjīṣin* (having *Ṛjīṣa*) is used as relating to Indra. In this word there is a hint of a lapse of time between the pressing of the juice and offering it to Indra. But this lapse of time is only in respect of the pressed stalk and not

with reference to the juice that is pressed out. This does not mean that in the juice itself there is a process of fermentaion. A stalk once pressed and kept over for some time does not give fermented juice, when pressed later. Soma is pressed and offered to the gods three times a day—morning, noon and evening. Here also, certain gods come for the morning oblation, some for the midday oblation and others for the evening one. But it does not mean that the gods who come in the evening get alcoholic, and hence intoxicating, Soma. So the word *Ṛjīṣa* gives no assistance in determining if Soma juice was an intoxicating one.

There is another word to be considered in this connection, and that is a more important word. It is *Tiro-ahnya. Tiraḥ* means "across", "laterally"; *Ahas* means "day". Thus *Tiro-ahnya* can mean "across the day", "what has been kept over the day". The word is differently explained. Modern scholars are more or less agreed on its meaning. Thus St. Petersburg Dictionary gives the meaning as Übertägig, *i.e.*, vorgestrig, vom Soma der zum Zweck der gährung stehen geblieben ist. Monier Williams gives the meaning: more than one day old; prepared the day before yesterday. Grassman's explanation, in his Wörterbuch is identical with what Roth gives, namely: was einen Tag hindurch (zur gährung) gestanden hat. Gährung means fermentation or clearing. I am not sure what Roth and Grassman had in their minds. If there is a general process of pressing the Soma and keeping the juice for fermentation for more than a day and if this is the case for Soma offered at any time and to any god, then there is a case for the postulate that Soma was an intoxicating drink. But this is not the case. *Tiro-ahnya* Soma is not offered to all the gods. It is not always *Tiro-ahnya* Soma that is offered at sacrifices. It has already

been remarked that Soma is, in the majority of cases, pressed and offered to the gods immediately. *Ṛjīṣa* and *Tiro-ahnya* Soma are exceptions.

According to the traditional interpretation, the word is explained in various ways and they are given below:

Sāyaṇa: तिरोअह्न्यं एतन्नामकम् । पूर्वस्मिन्नह्नि अभिषुतो यः सोमः उत्तरेऽहनि हूयते तस्यैतन्नामधेयम् । I-45-10

तिरोभूते पूर्वस्मिन् दिने अभिषुतं सोमम् । I-47-1

अह्नि तिरोहिते सति आहुतम् । III-28-3

अह्नि भवमह्न्यं दिवसकृतम् । तिरोभूतमह्न्यं यस्मिन् काले स तिरोअह्न्यः रात्रिकालः । तस्मिन् काले । III-28-6

तिरोहिते पूर्वस्मिन्नहनि अपरेद्युः प्रातरश्विनोर्यागः । VIII-35-19

Skandasvāmin: तार्तीयसावनिकः सोमविशेषः तिरोअह्न्य उच्यते । अथवा तिरः सत इति प्राप्तनामनी । प्राप्ते वर्तमाने यागाहे भवः तिरोअह्न्यः । I-45-10

Mādhava son of Veṅkaṭārya: प्राप्तेऽहनि भवः । III-28-3

Mādhava: यः सोमः पूर्वेद्युरभिषुतः परेद्युः प्रातर्हूयते तं तिरोअह्न्यं ब्रुवते । अह्नि तिरोहितेऽप्यास्ते इति । I-45-10

The *Tiro-ahnya* Soma is offered to Aśvins. And to Aśvins, the offering is made early in the morning. Thus "early morning Soma" seems to fit the word best. "As soon as the day is over" may be the real meaning of the word. Skandasvāmin seems to be inclined to relate this word with *Ṛjīṣa*; to him it is Soma offered in the evening. He has still another meaning, that it is Soma that is pressed on the appropriate day. It is not meant that *Ṛjīṣa* and *Tiro-ahnya* Soma are identical. The former is offered to Indra, while the

latter is for the As'vins. This relation of *Tiro-ahnya* Soma with the As'vins makes it very difficult to relate it to alcohol. There is no evidence of As'vins having become intoxicated with Soma drinking. It is usually in the descriptions of Indra that we may meet with ideas usually related to intoxication. Further, As'vins are associated with sweet drink. *Madhu* is the word that is associated with As'vins prominently. In so far as *Tiro-ahnya* Soma is given to As'vins and in so far as As'vins drink *Madhu* or sweet honey, we cannot assert that *Tiro-ahnya* Soma is fermented and alcoholic, and consequently intoxicating. This is the only expression that could give a hint about fermentation, and that expression also fails to yield that interpretation.

There is another point that must be taken note of. There are many words that mean Soma, used in the Vedas. Recently I read in a certain contribution a suggestion that *Andhas*, one of such words, may be related to *Andha*, blind, in so far as the intoxication of Soma makes a man blind. I had to inform the originator of this interpretation that the word may be related to the root *Ad* to eat, and that *Andhas* means only *Anna*. If Soma had been an intoxicating drink and a national drink, it is rather surprising that among the various names of Soma, none has retained the sense of a drink in later literature. *Madhu* is the only word among the various names that means alcoholic drink in latter-day Sanskrit, and *Madhu* has become the synonym of drink as a sweet drink rather than as a very strong drink. Soma means "moon". *Indu* is another word that has come to mean "moon" in later times. Most of the words that meant "Soma" in the Vedas have come to mean either the "moon" or "nectar" in later times. Some have come to mean "food" in general.

Soma has come from the heaven. There is the story of S'yena (falcon) having brought Soma from the heaven. This story appears in *Purāṇas* in connection with the taking away of *Amṛta* from heaven by Garuḍa. There is no evidence of any connection of Soma with an intoxicating drink either in the Vedas or its later developments in Indian culture. Semantics, mythology, the process of preparation—all these are against relating Soma with intoxication. Remnants of the story of Soma having been brought from the heaven are seen in the Avasta. There are some traces of it even in the Greek mythology, in the story of the "mead" having been brought from the Zeus. Thus Soma can be associated with only heaven and immortality which man attains through the worship of gods. Soma was used in the sacrifices with a symbolic significance and not as a national drink.

This is not saying that alcoholic drink was not known in the Vedic times. They certainly had *Surā*. This *Surā* played a great part in their religion, in ancient India. There are *Yāgas*, where *Surā* is used along with Soma or as a substitute of Soma. There are various domestic rites where *Surā* is used as a part of the rite. *Surā* is eulogised in the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya*, the standard medical work in Sanskrit. Drinking various kinds of alcohol is prescribed in this medical work for different seasons. But this is another story. The question is not whether ancient Indians drank alcohol; it is whether that national drink was Soma. And my thesis is that Soma was not alcoholic and intoxicating; it was not also a national drink.

ANŪPARATNĀKARA OF VIDYĀNĀTHA

BY K. MADHAVAKRISHNA SARMA

IN a previous issue of the Adyar Library Bulletin (December, 1945) I have dealt with the *S'āntisudhākara*, *Jyotpattisāra* and the *Yantracintāmaṇi* of Vidyānātha, written under the patronage of Maharaja Anupsingh. I have now come across another of his works, namely the *Anūparatnākara.* This was also written under the orders of Maharaja Anupsingh. There is a MS. of this in the Anup Sanskrit Library. Unfortunately it has not been preserved well. It is old and brittle. The original foliation is lost; many leaves are missing. There are 806 folios containing in all 18000 Granthas. Neither Mitra nor Aufrecht notices this work. Compiled with a view to containing all that is of popular interest in Sanskrit literature, this has very few equals.

The first two folios of the MS. are missing. The first two sections (named Kallolas) of the work deals with S'ālagrāmas, the MS. beginning:

ननु लक्षणं नाम लक्ष्यस्यासाधारणधर्मकथनम् । असाधारणत्वं लक्ष्यतावच्छेदकसमनियतत्वम् । एवं सति शालग्रामलक्षणे वक्तव्ये तस्य च लक्ष्यज्ञानमन्तरासंभवात्तल्लक्ष्यं किञ्चित्तु वनमालादिकं वा तद्विशिष्टा शिला वा लक्ष्या शुद्धा शिला वा ।

In Fol. 10*b* Kallola 1 ends with this colophon:

इति श्रीमन्निखिलभूपालमौलिमालामिलन्मुकुटतटनटन्मणिमरीचिमञ्जरीपुञ्जपिञ्जरितमञ्जुपादाम्बुजस्य प्रचण्डभुजदण्डचण्डिमाकर्णकुण्डलितकोदण्डताण्ड-

०।उद्दण्डरोद्दण्डखण्डितारिमुण्डपुण्डरीकमण्डिताखिलमहीमण्डलाखण्डलस्य श्रीमहाराजाधिराज-श्रीमदनूपसिंहदेवस्याज्ञया श्रीविद्यानाथविरचिते अनूपरत्नाकरे प्रथमः कल्लोलः ।

There are quotations here from the *Vaikhānasa Saṁhitā* and the Purāṇas. It may be noted that this part of the work is identical with *Anūpaviveka* or *S'ālagrāmaparīkṣā* of which there are three MSS. in the Library (2747, 7670-71). This ends fol. marked 99. Fol. 100 is in a different hand, and contains the colophon of Kallola 5 :

इति श्रीमन्निखिल० सामुद्रिकग्रन्थे पञ्चमः कल्लोलः ।

Kallola 6 deals with iconography, ending fol. 120. Then we have पुरुषस्त्रीसामुद्रिकलक्षणानि, going up to fol. 161. The authorities quoted on this are *Sāmudratilaka*, *Parās'ara*, Vātsya and Jaganmohana. Foll. 162—274 contain the *Sāmudracintāmaṇi* of S'rīgrāma Mādhava. This is a rare work of which no MS. is reported from any other collection. Foll. 275—280 are missing. Foll. 281—392 contain Bhānudatta's *Rasataraṅgiṇī*. This is followed by *Rājadharma* with extracts from Bṛhaspati, Mahābhārata, etc., on folios marked again 290—374. Then we have Gajalakṣaṇa, Turagalakṣaṇa, Golakṣaṇa, Chāgalakṣaṇa, Vṛsalakṣaṇa, Kukkuṭalakṣaṇa, S'valakṣaṇa, Gopuralakṣaṇa, Bhadrāsanalakṣaṇa, Chatralakṣaṇa, S'ayanāsanalakṣaṇa, Dīpalakṣaṇa, Ratnalakṣaṇa, Mauktikalakṣaṇa, Āyudhalakṣaṇa, S'ivaliṅgalakṣaṇa, and Citralakṣaṇa, ending fol. 845. At the end of Mauktikalakṣaṇa (fol. 631) there is this rubbed over with yellow figment :

जरन्निबन्धजातकं विचार्य सादरं चिरम् ।
अकारि राजरत्नकं पुरोहिताज्ञया मया ॥
यदत्र मञ्ज्वमञ्जु वा तदेव साधवः परम् ।

विशोधयन्तु ते धिया मया कृतोऽयमञ्जलिः ॥
गरीबदासाख्यपुरोहिताज्ञया श्रीराजरत्नाकरएष निर्मितः ।
रत्नाकरस्तस्य करोतु भव्यं श्रीराजसिंहस्य चिरं प्रसन्नः ॥

This is followed by the colophon :

इति श्रीमन्महाराजाधिराज श्रीमदनूपसिंहदेवाज्ञया विद्यानाथसूरिविरचिते ऽनूपरत्नाकरे नानामणिवर्णनं नाम कल्लोलः ।

This section is therefore a complete work written under the patronage of Purohita Gāribhadāsa, probably Maharaja Raisinghji's Purohita. The author's name is given as ढुण्ढिराज. Similarly the portion dealing with Gajalakṣaṇa is named *Rājasarvasva* of Kas'mīramaṅgalavarman.

The rest of the work (from fol. 845) deals with S'akuna.

The part dealing with Ratnas contains a large extract from Hemādri. On the whole the *Anūparatnākara* is a collection of some useful works and extracts with Vīdyā-nātha's own additions.

MANUSCRIPTS LIBRARY IN THE PALACE OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF JAIPUR

It is a matter of great pleasure to be able to announce that H. H. the Maharaja of Jaipur has been pleased to give sanction for the proper arrangement of the Manuscripts in the Palace and to have a catalogue prepared. All scholars will feel grateful to His Highness for this patronage to learning.

ED.—A.L.B.

MANUSCRIPTS NOTES

THE BĀLAVYUTPATTIKĀRIṆĪ OF S'OKKANĀTHA[1]

(A commentary on the *Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya* of Vāsudeva)

BY K. KUNJUNNI RAJA

THE *Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya* of the Kerala poet Vāsudeva, which has been published as No. 60 of the Kāvyamālā Series in 1897, is one of the best rimed poems (*yamakakāvyas*) in Sanskrit literature. The popularity that it once enjoyed throughout India is attested by the large number of commentaries, both in Sanskrit and in Malayalam,[2] that are available on the poem. The commentary *S'iṣyahitā* by Rājānaka Ratnakaṇṭha of Kashmir, composed in 1661 A.D. during the reign of Aurangzeb, has been published along with the *editio princeps* of the text. The *Bālavyutpattikāriṇī* of *S'okkanātha*,[3] the *Padārthacintana* of Rāghava[4] the disciple of S'rīkaṇṭha composed at the instance of King Keralavarma (1423-1445 A.D.) of Kolattunād, the *Prakās'ikā* of Dharmarāja belonging to the *Vatsagotra*,[5] the *Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa* by S'rīkaṇṭha, the

[1] Also known as Cokkanātha, the Tamil characters for S' and C being the same. But in all the MSS. that I have consulted the name is written as S'okkanātha. The commentary is also called *Bālavyutpattikārī*.

[2] A Malayalam commentary for the first three cantos has been printed from Kunnamkulam, 1913. For different MSS. of Malayalam commentaries see Adyar XXXIV-N-13, XXXI-A-5; Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library, 117 (Malayalam), etc.

[3] For details see *infra*.

[4] R. 5119. In the description of the MS. it is attributed to S'rīkaṇṭhadāsa but that the name of the commentator is Rāghava is known from the introductory verses.

[5] Tanjore, 3834.

disciple of S'rikaṇṭha,[1] the *Vijayadars'ikā* by Acyuta[2] and the *Padabhedinī* of unknown authorship[3] are known in manuscripts. The *Ratnapradīpikā* by S'ivadāsa seems to be another commentary on the poem.[4] Among all these commentaries the *Bālavyutpatti-kāriṇī* of S'okkanātha has been, perhaps, the most popular one in South India.

Several incomplete manuscripts of the work are known. The Madras Government Oriental MSS. Library has got three incomplete MSS. of the commentary. D. 11635 contains the commentary on cantos 1, 7 and 8; R. 2761 contains the commentary only for cantos 2 to 5[5]; and R. 4245 breaks off in the middle of the fifth canto. The Travancore Palace Library has two MSS. of the commentary. No. 1852 contains only the first three ās'vāsas; No. 1853 is a complete MS. of the commentary, but it is highly damaged and hence cannot be of much use. The Adyar Library seems to be the only place where we get complete MSS. of the commentary in good condition. Five MSS. of the commentary are available in this Library; I give below a short description of them:

1. Shelf No. XXI-P-27. Palm leaf MS. (made from the leaves of *Corypha umbraculifera*), size: 14.2″×1.8″, Folia 211. fairly old: worm-eaten and slightly injured, but in tolerably good condition. Fairly good writing in Malayalam character, lines 9-10 per page. Inked. Contains the commentary on cantos 1-8 complete,

2. Shelf No. XXI-Q-5. Palm leaf MS. (*Corypha* leaves). Folia 203, size 14.2″×2″. Fairly recent and in good condition. Fairly good writing in the Malayalam character, 11 lines per page. Inked. Complete but for the first folio which is missing.

[1] The only known MS. of the commentary is in the Adyar Library, XXI-Q-2.

[2] R. 3007, 3686.

[3] Travancore Palace Library, 1821, 1822.

[4] Mentioned by V. Rajarajavarma Raja in the *Keralīyasaṁskṛtasāhitya-caritra*, p. 181.

[5] According to the description of the MS. it contains the commentary of S'okkanātha for cantos 2 to 6; but on examination I find that it contains that only for cantos 2 to 5, the commentary on the sixth canto there being that of Rāghava (*Padārthacintana*).

3. Shelf No. XIX-0-4. Palm leaf MS. (same variety). Size 14″×1.4″. Folia 36. 13 lines per page, good small writing in the Malayalam character. Inked. Incomplete, contains the commentary for cantos 1 and 2 only. It has no wooden boards.

4. Shelf No. XXVII-I-57. Palm leaf MS. (made from the leaves of *Borassus Flabellifera*). Size 13″×1″. Folia 213. Fairly recent, but still slightly damaged and worm-eaten, medium cursory writing in the Grantha character. 8 lines per page. Inked. Incomplete, contains the commentary only for cantos 1 to 6 complete, and 7 incomplete.

5. Shelf No. X-F-21. Paper MS. Folia 119. Size, foolscap quarto. Good cursory writing in the Devanāgari character, 15 lines per page. Bound in cloth. Contains only the commentary on cantos 6 to 8. There are two *lacunae* in canto 8, between verses 20-28 and 70-77. This is a transcript copied by N. Venkatarama Sastri from the original MS. belonging to Ganapati Sastriyar of Kanassaluru in Coimbatore District on 18-12-1915.

S′okkanātha, the author of the commentary, was the son of Acciambā and Sudars′anabhaṭṭa of the Bhāradvāja gotra and Chandoga pravara. Hastigiribhaṭṭa of the Vatsa gotra was his preceptor; S′okkanātha belonged to the S′āttanūr village in the Cola country on the banks of the Kāveri river. He had an elder brother named Rāmacandrabhaṭṭa who was a great scholar in the various *smṛtis* like *Manusmṛti*. All this information can be gathered from the introductory portion of the commentary, the relevant verses from which are given below.[1]

यो वत्सान्वयवार्धिकौस्तुभमणिर्यश्चन्द्रचूडार्चन-
ध्यानस्तोत्रनमस्क्रियाद्यविकलव्यापारसर्वङ्कषः ।
यश्चाम्नायपुराणनाटककलावैदग्ध्यवासैकभू
स्तस्मै हस्तिगिरीश्वराख्यगुरवे कुर्वेऽञ्जलिं सादरम् ॥ ३ ॥

[1] For the other verses see the description in the Catalogue of the Madras Govt. MSS. Library, No. D. 11635.

सह्याद्रिप्रभवा समुद्रदयिता सर्वाघसङ्घापहा
शम्भुस्थानसहस्रभूषिततटा श्रीरङ्गनाथाश्रिता ।
कावेरीपरितो विभात्यतितरां यं शात्तनूराभिधं
ग्रामं सर्वकलाधुरीणसुजनं श्रीचोलभूभूषणम् ॥ ४ ॥
तस्मिन् सोमकलावतंसचरणध्यानैकतानात्मनो
भारद्वाजकुलाब्धिशीतमहसश्चक्राह्वयं बिभ्रतः ।
छन्दोगप्रवरस्य चारुकवितासञ्जातकीर्तेः सतः
पुत्रः पुण्यगुणाग्रणीर्निवसति श्रीशोक्कनाथः सुधीः ॥
शान्तिः किं नु शरीरिणी किमु दया कूलङ्कषा देहभाक्
शुद्धिर्मूर्तिमती तथा किमथ वा लक्ष्मीरुमा वेति च ।
आख्याता जनताभिरादरभरात्तत्तद्गुणानां गणैः
आच्चीनामवती जयत्यतितरां यस्य प्रसूर्भूतले ॥
मन्वादिधर्मशास्त्राणामर्थालोचनकोविदः ।
यस्याग्रजो रामचन्द्रभट्ट इत्यतिविश्रुतः ॥

The colophon at the end of each canto also points out to the effect.

"इति श्रीभारद्वाजकुलतिलकछन्दोगप्रवरसुदर्शनभट्टात्मजेन आच्चियम्बा-गर्भसम्भवेन मन्वादिस्मृतिमर्मज्ञरामचन्द्रभट्टानुजेन हस्तिगिरिभट्टशिष्येण शात्त-नूरग्रामवासिना विरचितायां बालव्युत्पत्तिकारिण्याख्यायां युधिष्ठिरविजयव्या-ख्यायां प्रथमाश्वासः ।" etc.,

The paper MS. No. X-F-21 contains an additional colophon at the end :

अष्टाश्वासीनिगदितान् सप्तत्रिंशत्समन्वितान् ।
व्याख्यन्नवशतश्लोकान् शोक्कनाथो यथामति ॥

[1] The number of verses in each canto is also given by the commentator see, description of D. 11635.

विक्रमाब्दे नभोमासि रेवतीसोमवासरे ।
कृष्णपक्षतृतीयायां व्याख्यैषा पूर्तिमेयुषी ॥
आदिमाश्वासपद्यानि न्यूनत्रयशतानि च ।
विंशाधिकशतश्लोकाः द्वितीयेऽथ तृतीयके ॥
त्रयोदशाधिकशतं तुरीये तूक्तमादिवत् ।
दशोत्तरशतं तत्र पञ्चमे षष्ठमे (sic) त्वथ ॥
चतुष्पञ्चाशदधिकशतपद्यानि सप्तमे ।
षट्चत्वारिंशदधिकशतश्लोका ह्यथाष्टमे ॥
एकोत्तरशतं त्विष्टं आद्यन्तश्लोकसङ्ख्यया ।
विलेखकेष्वेवकरापराधः निसर्गसिद्धो न विलोककेषु ।
यथाध्वगेषु प्रपदोपरोधः सुखोपविष्टेषु कुतः स एव ॥

According to A. S. Ramanatha Ayyar [1] one MS. of the work in the Travancore Palace Library also contains the verse "विक्रमाब्दे—" This seems to show that the writing of the commentary was completed in the year Vikrama, nabhas (S'rāvaṇa) month, Monday, Revati and Black Tṛtīya. Ramanatha Ayyar says [2] that all these details seem to be correct for A.D. 1760 August 29. But from Swamikannu Pillai's *Indian Ephemeris* it is found that 29th August, 1760 fell on a Friday and not on a Monday. It is also found that the only day between 1500–1900 A.D. when all the details given in the verse will be almost correct is in 1880 August 23, which is too late for the date of S'okkanātha. From a study of the context in which this verse occurs in the Adyar MS. it is clear that it must have been composed by the scribe and hence must be referring to the date of copying of the MS. For we find the word '*ṣaṣṭhama*' used in one of the verses: evidently we cannot expect such a flagrant solicism from the learned commentator. Again the

[1] *Ramavarmayas'obhūṣaṇa and Vasulakṣmīkalyāṇa* by A. S. Ramanatha Ayyar, Indian Antiquary, LIII (1924), pp. 1ff. In the description of the MSS. of the Travancore Palace Library nothing is mentioned about this colophon.

[2] *Ibid.*

first verse there gives the total number of verses of the text as 937, but by adding the number of verses he himself has given for the cantos separately the total becomes 938. Moreover the last verse is evidently by the scribe. Hence we have to take the verse giving the date also as composed by the scribe. So the additional colophon only gives the date of copying of the MS. (*i.e.* of the *exemplar* of the Paper MS. in the Adyar Library, and perhaps of the MS. in the Travancore Palace Library also).

We know of more than one S'okkanātha, and consequently there has been difference of opinion among scholars about the problem of identifying some of them.[1]

There is one S'okkanātha famous as the father-in-law of Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita. He is the author of the *S'abdakaumudī*, *Bhāṣyaratnāvali* and the *Dhāturatnāvali*, all dealing with grammar. His father was Dvādas'āhayāji Nārāyaṇa Dikṣita, and his mother Gaṇapati. He was a Chandoga Brahmin of the S'aunaka gotra, and Drāhyāyaṇa sūtra. Since Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita flourished in the second half of the seventeenth century, this S'okkanātha may be assigned to the middle of the century.

The author of the *Sevantikāpariṇaya*, the *Kāntimatīpariṇaya*, and the *Rasavilāsa Bhāṇa* is also one S'okkanātha. He was the son of Tippādhvarin and Narasāmbā, and belonged to the Bhāradvāja gotra and the Ās'valāyana sūtra. He had five brothers Kuppādhvarin, Tirumalai, Svāmiyajvan, Sītarāma S'āstri and Tippādhvarin, of whom the first four were elder to him.[2] His father Tippādhvarin and the eldest brother Kuppādhvarin were donees of lands free of taxes in the village of Sāhajimahārājapuram (Tiruvis'anallur near Kumbhakonam). His *Sevantikāpariṇaya*

[1] On different S'okkanāthas see: *Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita and the Southern poets of his time*, by T. S. Kuppuswami Sastri, Tanjore, Indian Antiquary, XXXIII (1904), pp. 126ff, 176ff.; A. S. Ramanatha Ayyar, *op. cit.*; Introduction to the *Sevantikāpariṇaya*, Edited by M. S. Pattabhiramiah, Sridhara Press, Trivandrum, 1921; *Life of Cokkanāthamakhin*, by S. Vaidyanatha Sastri, Journal of Oriental Research, Madras, vol. IV, pp. 261ff.; *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*, by M. Krishnamachariar, pp. 243f, 802n.

[2] The *Kāntimatīparinaya* gives the names of four of the brothers (I. A. XXXIV, p. 130) and one Ms. of the *Sevantikāpariṇaya*) gives the names of all the five brothers (Int. *Sevantikāpariṇaya*, p. 1).

describes the marriage of Basavarāja and Sevantikā, the daughter of a king of Malabar; his *Kāntimatīpariṇaya* is a drama describing the marriage of king Ṣāhāji with Kāntimatī. S'okkanātha was patronised by these two kings: Sāhāji of Tanjore (1684-1711 A.D.) and Basava of South Canara (Probably Ikkeri Basavappa Nāyak 1691-1714 A.D.).

There is still another S'okkanātha; he is the father of Sadās'ivamakhin the author of the *Rāmavarmayas'obhūṣaṇa* and the *Lakṣmīkalyāṇa*. This S'okkanātha's wife was Mīnākṣī, and he belonged to the Bhāradvāja gotra. Sadās'ivamakhin was patronised by king Rāmavarma of Travancore (1758-1798 A.D.), and hence his father S'okkanātha must have flourished in the middle of the eighteenth century.

A. S. Ramanatha Ayyar has[1] tentatively identified Ṣ'okkanātha, the author of the *Bālavyutpattikāriṇī* with the father of Sadās'iva. Krishnamachariar wants,[2] on the other hand, to identify the father of Sadās'ivadikṣita with the father-in-law of Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita and also with the author of the *Sevantikāpariṇaya*. Krisnamachariar's identification is evidently wrong; for the difference in parentage and in dates shows that the three S'okkanāthas are not identical.

S'okkanātha the commentator of the *Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya* cannot be identified either with the father-in-law of Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita or with the author of the *Sevantikāpariṇaya*, because his parentage is different. And for his identity with the father of Sadās'iva Dīkṣita, there is no positive evidence.

S'okkanātha cites numerous writers and works in his commentary. I have made an exhaustive list of these authorities. I give below the list arranged in alphabetical order:

अजयः, अद्वैतवादिनः, अमरः, अमरकोशव्याख्या, अम्बास्तवः, आपस्तम्बः, उणादि, उत्पलमाला, उपनिषत्, कपिलः, कविकल्पद्रुमः, कवि-

[1] op. cit.
[2] op. cit. p. 243f.

गजाङ्कुशः (शुनीदुग्धमिव त्याज्यं काव्यं शूद्रकृतं बुधैः । गवां पय इव ग्राह्यं काव्यं विप्रेण निर्मितम् । Fol. 3*b*, XXI-Q-5), कात्यायनः, कामिकाद्यागमानुसारिणः, कालिदासः, काव्यदर्पणः (एकार्थताभ्रान्तिकरानेकशब्दनिबन्धने । पुनरुक्तवदाभासं प्रवदन्ति विपश्चितः । commentary on verse 113, canto III), काव्यप्रकाशः, काशिका, कुमारसम्भवः (कालिदासः), केशवः, कैयटः, गौतमः, चन्द्रालोकः, चान्द्रसूत्रम् (तथा चान्द्रं सूत्रं 'ऋतेयोगे द्वितीया च' इति । under verse 49, canto III), चिन्तामणिः, टीकासर्वस्वः (सर्वानन्द), दण्डी, दशरूपकः, दुर्घटः (महिलायां महेलापि इति दुर्घटः । under 69, II), धातुपाठः, ध्वनिकार; नलोदयः, निगमः, नैषधम्, न्यासकारः, पराशरः, पाणिनिः, पाद्मपुराणम् (पाद्मे महापुराणे उपरिखण्डे शिवगीतायाम् etc. Fol. 1*b*, XXI-Q-5), पुलस्त्यः, पुष्पदन्तमहिम्नस्तवः, प्रक्रियाकौमुदी (under verse 93, canto VI), प्रबोधयमकः ("आश्रित्य दुर्गं गिरिकन्दरोदरं क्रीडत्यमुष्मिन् सततं दरोदरम् ।" इति प्रबोधयमकात् दकारो निरुकारः । under verse 70, canto III), प्राकृतसूत्रम्, बालभारतम्, बृहद्याज्ञवल्क्यम्, बोमकोण्टीयम् (p. 164, X. F. 21). भगवद्गीता, भट्टिः, भट्टोद्भटः, भवभूतिः, भागुरिः ('प्रसादोध्यवसाये स्यात् स्वच्छानुग्रहयोरपि' इति भागुरिः । under verse 107, canto III), भामहः, भारतीयम्, भावप्रकाशिका, भोजः, मङ्खुसूत्रम्, महाभाष्यम्, महाभारतम् (भारतम्) (आदिपर्व, आरण्यपर्व, विराटपर्व, etc.), माघः, माधवः ('घूः स्त्रीलिङ्गे भवेदग्रे भारे च युगविश्वयोः' इति माधवः । Fol 23*b*. XXI-Q-5), मालतीमाधवम् (भवभूतिः), मीमांसकाः, मेघसन्देशः (कालिदासः), याज्ञवल्क्यः, यादवः, रघुवंशम् (कालिदासः), रत्नमाला, रभसः रसार्णवः (रसार्णवसुधाकरः) ('अङ्गान्यभूषितान्येव प्रक्षेपाद्यैर्विभूषणैः । येन भूषितवद्भाति तद्रूपमिति कथ्यते' । under verse 80, canto II), राणकः, रामायणम्, रुद्रः, वररुचिः, वार्तिकम् (कात्यायनः), वामनः, विक्रमोर्वशीयम् (कालिदासः), विद्यानाथः, विश्वः, वृद्धमनुः, वोपालितः, व्याडिः, व्यासः, शब्दभेदप्रकाशः, शब्दरत्नाकरः, शब्दरत्नाकरशेषः, शब्दार्णवः, शम्भुरहस्यम्, शाबरभाष्यम्, शाश्वतः, शृङ्गारतिलकम्, श्रुतिः,

सज्जनः ('इङ्गितं हृद्गतो भावः बहिराकार आकृतिः' इति सज्जनः । under verse 76, canto V.), सर्वानन्दः, सरस्वतीकण्ठाभरणम् (भोजः), सहस्रनामस्तोत्रं, साहित्यचूडामणिः, सुप्रभेदागमः, सौभाग्यविद्यागमः, स्कान्दम्, हरिः (भर्तृहरिः), हरिः ('संरम्भः सम्भ्रमाटोपा' इति हरिश्च । under verse 11, canto V), हलायुधः, हेलाराजः ।

Of these the latest authority referred to is the *Kāvyadarpaṇa* of Rājacūḍamaṇi Dikṣita who flourished in the former half of the seventeenth century.[1] It is quite surprising that S'okkanātha who cites more than hundred authorities, does not refer at all to Appaya Dīkṣita, Jagannātha Paṇḍita or Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita though he is much later than all these popular writers. Anyhow the reference to the *Kāvyadarpaṇa* clearly shows that the *terminus a quo* to the date of S'okkanātha must be c. 1650 A.D. As the *terminus ad quem* to his date we can only give 1880 A.D., which is the date of transcription of a MS. of his commentary. Quite possibly he might have flourished in the 18th century. This partly supports Ramanatha Ayyar's view that this S'okkanātha was the father of Sadās'iva Dīkṣita. But we have already seen that there is no positive evidence to identify them.

From a detailed study of the commentary it is found that the text followed by S'okkanātha is slightly different from the text in the *editio princeps*. In none of the MSS. of the commentary does the commentator cite the text in full; from the *lemmata* (*Pratīkas*) and from the order in which the words are taken for explanation—which is according to the prose order—we have to infer the nature of the text followed by him. It is not possible here to give an exhaustive list of the *variae lectiones*; still some of the more important differences may be mentioned below.

The printed text contains 934 verses arranged in the eight cantos as 97, 118, 113, 97, 109, 152, 143, and 105 respectively; but

[1] The verse cited by S'okkanātha is found in Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dikṣita's *Kāvyadarpaṇa* (chapter, vii, verse 52.). And Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dikṣita's date is definitely known since he composed his *Tantras'ikhāmaṇi* in 1636 A. D. (See M. Krishnamachariar, *op. cit.*, p. 235.)

the commentary is on 938 verses, the eight contos cantaining 97, 120, 113, 97, 110, 154, 146, and 101 verses respectively.

In canto II, three additional verses are explained by the commentator. Two of them—'भूत्वा परमो हंसः—' after verse 30 and 'निन्दितकुन्दप्रसवा—' after verse 62—are given in the foot notes of the printed text as the version in *mūla pustaka*. The third is after verse 32; the prose order given there is:

पटुमनसेति—तत्र पटुमनसा हरिणाक्षी अक्षीणकुचभरा सा यतये विनियुक्ता; इङ्गितज्ञया तया भद्राय अस्मै रुरुचे।

The verse seems to be;

पटुमनसा हरिणाक्षीणकुचभरा तत्र सा च हरिणाक्षी।
रुरुचे भद्रायतयेङ्गितज्ञयास्मै . . . विनियुक्ता यतये॥

Verse 59 of the text is omitted in the commentary, and in its place verse 105 is taken; so verse 106 follows verse 104 in the commentary.

In canto V, there is an additional verse after verse 77, the prose order given in the commentary being:

पृथ्वेति—पृथुमदबलमानानां तेषु नियुद्धरङ्गेषु वलमानानां विकीर्णधम्मिल्लानां मल्लानां वधं तत्र चक्रे।

The verse may be reconstructed as:

पृथुमदबलमानानां नियुद्धरङ्गेषु तेषु वलमानानाम्।
तत्र वधं मल्लानां चक्रे . . . विकीर्णधम्मिल्लानाम्॥

There are two additional verses in canto VI, one after verse 60, and the other after verse 147. The prose order given is:

मधुरेति—क्षितिपः वैरिराजयमस्य जयं मधुरगिरा पप्रच्छ, सोऽपि च तदवाप्त्य दैवापत्यप्रतिपादितं अभ्यधात्।

बिभ्रतमिति—अध्वजवं बिभ्रतं पतङ्गमध्वजवन्तं रथं अधिरूढः अयं जनार्दनः रिपुनरापायं चिन्तयन् पार्थान् पुनराप ।

The two verses may be reconstructed as :[1]

मधुरगिरा जयमस्य क्षितिपः पप्रच्छ वैरिराजयमस्य ।
सोऽपि च दैवापत्यप्रतिपादितमभ्यधात् तदैवापत्य ॥
बिभ्रतमध्वजवं तं रथमधिरूढः पतङ्गमध्वजवन्तम् ।
पार्थान् पुनरापायं जनार्दनश्चिन्तयन् रिपुनरापायम् ॥

Of the three additional verses commented in canto VII, the two verses 'नागानागाचारु—' after verse 14, and 'वीर्यमपक्षयमस्य—' after verse 132 are given in the footnotes of the printed text as the additional verses of the *mūla pustaka.* The third is after verse 123, and the prose order is :

स च अङ्कं पुनरागतं शोणितौः सरागतमं कं भुवि क्षिप्त्वा (सद्यः) नाशं जगाम यः इममर्थं स्नेहेन पुरा आशंसत ।

The reconstructed verse would be

स च पुनरागतमङ्कं क्षिप्त्वा भुवि शोणितैः सरागतमं कम् ।
स्नेहेनाशंसद्यः पुरेममर्थं जगाम नाशं सद्यः ॥

In canto VIII, the four verses, 54-57, beginning with "रण-कृतिनां—" are omitted in the commentary ; and before commenting on verse 47, S'okkanātha says :

"रणकृतिनामित्यादि पद्यचतुष्कं कुत्रचित्कोश एव दृश्यत इति प्रक्षिप्त-शङ्कया न व्याख्यातम् ।"

Among the minor changes the following may be mentioned :

	Printed Text	Text followed by commentator
I. verse 66	पुरमगमच्छस्तस्य	अथ गृहमच्छस्तस्य

[1] Reconstructed with the help of the MS. D. 11634 (Madras).

			द्विजस्य सदनं सरागम-च्छस्तस्य ।	द्विजस्य कोप्यतिथिरागमच्छस्तस्य ।
I.	verse	78	दूतगिरा	दूरगिरा
	,,	79	अथ	ते
II.	,,	16	समुद्गत . . . पुरोदरवस्तु	समुद्गतपुरवरोदरवस्तु
	,,	32	व्यग्रेषु	व्यक्तेषु
	,,	33	The two halves are interchanged in commentary.	
III.	,,	17	उत्थितापदा	Also gives उज्झितापदा
	,,	33	तथ्य	सत्य
	,,	41	जननिलय	जलनिलय
	,,	55	सबृहत्	सुबृहत्
	,,	100	अपि चलपादपवनत:	भञ्जितपादपवनत:
IV.	After verse 5, the commentary takes verse 9, and then 6, 7, 8, 10.			
	,,	18	तां	त्वां
	,,	70	धृत	Also धुत
	,,	79	विगलित	विरचित
V.	,,	20	भ्रान्त्वा	भ्रात्रा
	,,	24	The commentary gives दर्शय लवणार्णवतारि as an emendation.	
	,,	45	विप्र	वप्र
	,,	55	सकट	सुकटु
VI.	,,	33	सोथाभियानादरिभि:	सोऽथ भियानादरिभि:
	,,	44	अतायि	अदायि, अनायि
	,,	49	विषदा	द्विषदा
	,,	58	प्रीतिमलं भेजे य: स्वयं जयन् कौरवेऽबलं-भेजेय: ।	प्रीतिं लेभेऽजेय: स्वयं जयं कौरवे बले भेजेय: ।

	verse 98	परदेवनतान्त	परिदेवनतान्त
VII.	,, 81	समरं	सरसं, सरथं
	,, 104	भूत्वा सन्नाश्वस्तान् हत्वा	पीत्वा सन्नाश्वस्तान् कृत्वा
	,, 129	समितं वासीदन्तं	समितावासीदन्तं
	,, 130	निशि	तं
VIII.	,, 30	रिपुगण	अरिगण
	,, 31	तस्य	अस्य

Verses 45 and 46 of the text are interchanged in the commentary; so also verses 48 and 49.

,, 61	सरसं खे	सति सङ्ख्ये
,, 71	विधृतरसं	धृतरभसं
,, 68	कृतरिपुमानवनाशं	सच रिपुमानवनाशं
,, 88	उद्धंतरोद	तद्धुतरोद

A few of these variants are given in the foot-notes of the printed text. It may be noted here that the version of the text that Barthelomeo de san Paolino had with him was also slightly different from the Kavyamāla Text, and almost similar to the one followed by S'okkanātha.[1]

S'okkanātha's commentary is a very useful one. He quotes profusely parallel passages from the *Mahābhārata* to explain the text, and points out even minute changes from the original story. He quotes numerous authorities in support of his explanation; and in the case of rare words he gives parallel usages of great poets also.

That Vāsudeva, the author of the poem, belonged to Kerala was known to S'okkanātha;[2] still he does not note that some of

[1] Zeitschrift für Indologie & Iranistik, vol. IV, p. 233 f.

[2] *Vide* "वासुदेवो नाम केरलीयकविः" in the beginning of the commentary.

the irregular usages in the text are due to the peculiarities of Kerala pronounciation. Thus V-44 of the text has,

'नवघनवद्गुरुरोध: स्थगयन्निषुवर्षणेन धल्गु रुरोध ।'

S'okkanātha says:

"अत्र गुरुरोध इत्येव यमकं वकारस्यापि यमकान्तर्भावे आदौ तकारेण गकारस्य योग: आवृत्तौ लकारेण गकारस्येति यमकभङ्गात् । उभयत्र न तकार-योग:, उणादौ वलेर्गुक् च इति गुगागमविधानात् ॥

Thus he takes the rime only in the portion गुरुरोध; but really it is for the whole of वल्गु रुरोध. The pronounciations of द्गु and ल्गु are the same in Kerala even to this day; the consonant 'd' in such a juxtaposition is in all cases pronounced there as 'l'. This peculiarity must have been existent even at the time of Vāsudeva. That seems to be the correct explanation for the rime between द्गु and ल्गु.

In VI-93, and in VIII-50, the poet uses the form '—सृक्' to rime with the word असृक्, though according to the ordinary explanation of Pāṇini's rules the correct form is 'सृट्'. S'okkanātha defends the use thus:

"सृगिति कथं कुत्वं, व्रश्चभ्रस्जसृजमृजेत्यादिना षत्वविधानात् सृडित्येव रूपं स्यात् । नैतत् क्विन् प्रत्ययस्य कुरिति सूत्रे अतत्संविज्ञानबहुव्रीहि-समासाश्रयणात् अक्विन्प्रत्ययान्तेऽपि । सृगित्यस्य तेन कुत्वं स्यादेव । अत एव प्रक्रियाकौमुद्यां असृज: पदान्ते कुत्वमित्युक्तम । क्विन् प्रत्ययस्य कुरिति सूत्रे प्रत्ययग्रहणं क्विन्वादिप्रत्ययान्तरेऽपि कुत्वं क्वचित् इति न्यासकार: ।"

Here also it is to be noted that '—सृक्' has heen considered to be a correct form in Kerala. "विधाता विश्वसृग्विधि:" (for विधाता विश्वसृड् विधि:) has been the Kerala reading in the *Amarakos'a.*

THE COMMENTARIES ON THE SAṀKALPA-SŪRYODAYA

BY V. KRISHNAMACHARYA

The Saṁkalpasūryodaya is well known as an allegorical drama in 10 acts written by S'rī Vedāntades'ika with a view to expounding the philosophical truth of the Vis'iṣṭādvaita system of Vedānta and needs no further introduction. There are many commentaries on the work and none of them has till now been brought to light by a critical edition. The commentaries that are now available are :

1. *Prabhāvilāsa* by Ahobalasūri of Ātreya family.
2. *Prabhāvali* (anonymous).
3. *Vivaraṇa* by S'rīnivāsa of Kaus'ika family.
4. *Vyākhyā* by Nṛsiṁharāja (?).
5. *Vyākhyā* by S'rībhāṣya Nārāyaṇa of S'rīvatsa family.
6. *Vyākhyā*, by Nārāyaṇa of S'rīvatsa family (different from the above).

I. The commentary called Prabhāvilāsa was written by Ahobalasūri of Ātreya family. Complete MSS. of the commentary are available in the Adyar Library and Government Oriental MSS. Library, Madras.[1] The commentary begins thus :

श्रीशं श्रियं वेंकटदेशिकेन्द्रं पराङ्कुशार्यं यमिनं प्रणम्य ।
अहोबलोऽयं विवृणोमि विद्वान् संकल्पसूर्योदयमत्रिवंश्यः ॥

इह खलु भगवान् कवितार्किककण्ठीरवः सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्रः श्रीमान् वेंकटनाथो नाम वेदान्ताचार्यः श्रीमच्छारीरकभाष्यस्यातिगहनगम्भीरतया तत्रायासमसहमानान् शिष्यानवेलोक्य दयालुतया तदाश्रितार्थजातं सुखेन प्रतिबोधयितुं नाटकापदेशेन प्रकटयन् आशीराद्यन्यतमस्य शिष्टाचारतयाशीर्वादरूपं मङ्गलमाचरति-यद्वक्तीत्यादि ।

[1] Vide Nos. 29-I-6; 30-E-33; 30-F-21 and 54-C-6 of the Adyar Library and R. No. 1855; D. No. 12713 and D. No. 12714 of the Govt. Oriental MSS. Library, Madras.

Colophon :

इत्यात्रेयगोत्रसंभूतेन श्रीमदहोबलनाम्ना विदुषा विरचिते संकल्पसूर्योदय-
व्याख्याने प्रभाविलासाख्याने निःश्रेयसलाभो नाम दशमोऽङ्कः ।

From the passages given above it is understood that the author Ahobala was a pupil of Parāṅkus'ayati and a descendant of the Ātreya family. He is also known to have written two different commentaries on the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki by the name *Tanis'lokī*[1] and *Vālmīkihṛdaya*.[2] In the former commentary he salutes Parāṅkus'ayati describing him as to have consecrated the images of bhaktas in the temple at Nīlādri *alias* Puruṣottama. Vide the beginning of the Tanis'lokī :

भक्तप्रतिष्ठा नीलाद्रौ कलिता येन सूरिणा ।
सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्रं तं पराङ्कुशमुनिं भजे ॥

Another author called S'aṭhakopamuni, who also was the disciple of Parāṅkus'ayati, glorifies him in his *Vāsantikāpariṇaya* thus :[3]

पूर्वं यस्तु मुकुन्ददेवविभुना स्कन्धे धृतान्दोलिकः
प्राप्तः श्रीपुरुषोत्तमं रचितवान् भक्तप्रतिष्ठापनम् ।
लब्ध्वा दन्तितुरंगरत्नशिबिकाच्छत्रद्वयीचामर-
द्वन्द्वादीनि ययौ पुनश्च विजयी कर्नाटसिंहासनम् ॥

It is, therefore, clear that both Ahobala and S'aṭhakopamuni mention one and the same Parāṅkus'ayati in their works. Historians identify the king Mukundadeva mentioned in the verse quoted above with Mukunda Harichandan who usurped the kingdom of Orissa and set up as an independent sovereign and was ally of Aliya Rāmarāya of Vijayanagar (1520 A.D.).[4]

[1] R. No. 1626 of the Madras Govt. Ori. MSS. Library.

[2] D. Nos. 1889 and 14903 of the Govt. Ori. MSS. Library.

[3] D. 12662 of the Govt. Ori. MSS. Library.

[4] Page 233 of the Sources Vijayanagar History by Dr. S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar, 1919.

This Mukundadeva may also be identified with the patron of Mārkaṇḍeyakavi, the author of the Prākṛtasarvasva,

श्रीमद्वीरमुकुन्ददेवनृपतौ दोःस्तम्भकुम्भीनस-
क्रीडाग्रस्तसमस्तशात्रवकुलप्राणानिले सर्वतः ।
शासत्युत्कलमेदिनीं रघुपतौ साक्षादयोध्यामिव
ग्रामे वीरवरप्रतापनृपतेः पूर्णो निबन्धो नवः ॥

In the S'ri-Vaiṣṇava tradition this Parāṅkuas'ayati was called as Saṣṭha Parāṅkusasvāmin or the 6th pontiff of the Ahobala Maṭh.

The author of the *Vāsantikāpariṇaya* gives the following list of successors in the Maṭh :

1. Ādi-Vaṇ-S'aṭhakopasvāmin (1398 to 1458 A.D.)
   Vaidikasārvabhauma *alias* Hārīta Veṅkaṭes'a is said to have written the works Smṛtiratnākara, Das'anirṇaya etc., under the direction of this svāmin.[1]
2. Nārāyaṇasvāmin (1459 to 1472 A.D.)
   He is said to have been the author of 60 works such as *Sandayāvandanamantrabhāṣya*, *Nyāsaviṁs'ativyākhyā*, *Rahasyatrayajīvātu*.[2]
3. Parāṅkus'asvāmin (1473 to 1485 A.D.)
   He established the villages Kalattore, Pilappattur, Niralur etc. He is said to have died in Kali year 4585 = 1485 A.D.
4. S'rīnivāsa S'aṭhakopasvāmin (1485 to 1494 A.D.)
   He was the author of the *Nyāyaparis'uddhivyākhyā Nikaṣā* wherein he says that he was the pupil of Parāṅkus'amuni and Ahobalācārya. This Ahobalācārya may be identified with Ahobalācārya of S'rī-Vatsa family who is known in the S'rī-Vaiṣnavaguruparamparā

[1] D. 2805 and 3124 of the Madras Govt. Ori. MSS. Library.
[2] D. 2876, 10145 and 5339 of the Govt. Ori. MSS. Library.

as the pupil of Varadaviṣṇu.[1] Therefore this Ahobalācārya should not be confounded with the author of the *Prabhāvilāsa* under reference. This S'rīnivāsasathakopasvāmin is also said as the grand-son of Vaidikasārvabhauma *alias* Hārita Veṅkates'a; Vide the colophons of the *Nikaṣā*.[2]

इति कवितार्किकमतङ्गजकेसरिणः सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्रस्य श्रीमद्वैदिकसार्वभौमपौत्रस्य श्रीमत्पराङ्कुशयतिशिष्यस्य श्रीनिवासशठकोपयतेः कृतौ न्यायपरिशुद्धिव्याख्यायां निकषाख्यायां स्मृत्यध्याये प्रथममाह्निकम् ।

इति कवितार्किकमतङ्गजकेसरिणः सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्रस्य श्रीपराङ्कुशयतिपादसरोरुहभ्रमरस्य श्रीमदहोबलार्यकृपापात्रस्य श्रीनिवासशठकोपयतेः कृतौ न्यायपरिशुद्धिव्याख्यायां निकषाख्यायां प्रमेयाध्याये प्रथममाह्निकम् ।

5. Vaṇ-S'aṭhakopasvāmin (1494 to 1492 A.D.)
6. Ṣaṣṭha Parāṅkus'asvāmin (1499 to 1513 A.D.)
   He was the preceptor of Ātreya Ahobala, the author of the Prabhāvilāsa under reference. He was honoured by Mukundadeva as mentioned in the *Vāsantikāpariṇaya*.
7. Vaṇ-S'aṭhakopasvāmiṅ (1513 to 1521 A.D.)
   He was the author of the *Vāsantikāpariṇaya*. He was the native of Bālavana *alias* Ilaṅgāḍu, son of S'rinivāsācarya of Bhāradvājagotra, grandson of Cāmarācārya and great-grandson of Anantācārya. His original name as gṛhastha was Tirumalācārya.[3]

Therefore, Ahobala may be placed in the beginning of the 16th century A.D. He refers herein more than 40 works of which the following few may be mentioned:

1. *Camatkāracandrikā* by Visves'vara (1350 A.D.)

[1] S'rī Vaiṣṇavaguruparamparā:

श्रीमद्वरदविष्ण्वार्यपदपङ्कजषट्पदम् ।
अहोबलगुरुं वन्दे वत्सवंशैकमौक्तिकम् ॥

[2] D. 4912 of the Madras Govt. Ori. MSS. Library: and Adyar Library MS. No. 1-A-3. Pages 305 and 454.

[3] D. No. 12662 of the Madras Govt. Ori. MSS. Library.

2. *Sāhityacintāmaṇi* by Vīranārāyaṇa (1420 A.D.)
3. *Nāṭakaparibhāṣā* by S'iṅgabhūpāla (1350 A.D.)
4. *Alaṁkārasaṁgraha* by Amṛtānanda.
5. *Locanāñjana* (anonymous).
6. *Rativilāsa.*
7. *Vṛkṣaraksāmaṇi.*

Nos. 1 to 3 are useful in fixing our author in a period later than the 15th Century A.D. While commenting upon the stanza, *viz* :

न तच्छास्त्रं न सा विद्या न तच्छिल्पं न ताः कलाः ।
नासौ योगो न तज्ज्ञानं नाटके यन्न दृश्यते [1] ॥

quoted in the text, our Commentator states that the stanza was taken from the *Alaṁkārasaṁgraha* of Amṛtānanda. The statement has been verified and the stanza is found in the 7th Chapter of the work. Hence the date of the *Alaṁkārasaṁgraha* may be held as earlier than that of S'rī Vedāntades'ika (1269 to 1369 A.D.). The *Locanāñjana* may be placed in a period earlier than 1530 A.D. The two works namely *Rativilāsa* and *Vṛkṣarakṣāmaṇi* are new and nothing is known about them.

II. The *Prabhāvali* is another Commentary on the drama. The name of the commantator is not known. This commentary also, like Ahobala's is elaborate and valuable.

This commentary was incompletely printed and published in the Pandit Series, Benares upto a portion of the 5th act. A complete palm leaf MS. of this commentary is available in the Adyar Library (No. 34. C. 28).

The commentary begins thus :

वरदार्यमहं वन्दे वरणीयगुणाकरम् ।
वनस्पतीनामपि यद्वाणी वाचस्पतित्वदा ॥
त्र्यन्तगूढं तत्त्वानां त्रिकं तद्यत्प्रसादतः ।

[1] Saṁkalpasūryodaya, act 1. Stanza 20.

स्फुटं पश्यति मन्दोऽपि तं वेदान्तगुरुं भजे ॥
वेदान्तोत्तंसभूतास्ता वेदान्ताचार्यसूक्तयः ।
क्रियासमभिहारेण कुर्यासुः श्रेयसां ततिम् ॥
क्वाहं मन्दमतिः क्वासौ वेदान्तार्यगिरां गतिः ।
साहसं महदेतन्मे क्षन्तुमर्हन्ति सत्तमाः ॥

इह खलु भगवानशेषशेषी श्रीमान्नारायणस्तापत्रयातुरसकलसंसारिचेतनोज्जिजीवयिषया अशेषोपनिषदुद्घोषितांस्तत्त्वहितपुरुषार्थान् सम्यक् प्रदर्शयितुकामः शठरिपुनाथयोगियामुनाचार्यसंयमीन्द्रप्रमुखानवतार्य तत्तत्प्रणीतानेकप्रबन्धमुखेन समीचीनज्ञानमुत्पाद्य कांश्चित् कृतार्थान् विधाय तत्तत्समयमतिलङ्घ्य जातानां दुर्दशामवेक्ष्य कारुण्यपरवशः स्वयमेव कविकथककण्ठीरवदेशिकात्मनावततार ।

End :

स्तोतुमिति । जगति वर्तमानोऽस्मदुक्तमस्मत्कृतिं स्तोतुं गुणकथनेन प्रशंसितुं निन्दितुं दोषोद्भावनेन दूषयितुं सोढुं गुणदोषौ सोढुं समूढं सम्यग्युक्तं भवतु । अनन्तः अनवधिः । चिन्तनेन परमात्मचिन्तनेन । यद्वा अनन्तस्य भगवतश्चिन्तनेन यो रसः प्रीतिस्तद्रूपे सुखे तस्थुषामस्माकं किं छिन्नम् ; न किमपीत्यर्थः ।

Colophon :

इति प्रभावल्याख्यायां श्रीमत्संकल्पसूर्योदयव्याख्यायां दशमोऽङ्कः ।

From the first stanza of the introductory portion of the commentary the author is known to have been a disciple of one Varadārya who still remains unidentified.

III. The *Vivaraṇa* is another Commentary on the drama. The author Srinivāsācarya was the son of Tātārya of Kaus'ika family. There are two MSS. in the Adyar Library and they represent only fragments of the commentary.[1] The first contains the 1st act without beginning and the second act without end. The second MS. contains the acts 6th to 8th. It begins thus :

[1] MS. Nos. 23-G-37 ; 30-F-22.

स्तम्भो जाड्यम् । सदागमप्रतिरोधकः सतामागमानां शास्त्राणां प्रतिरोधकः । कञ्चुकिपक्षे तु सत्पुरुषागमनिरोधकः । वलिभिरिति । दुर्निवारा वारयितुमशक्या ।

End :

पुष्पवृष्टिरिव आकाशात् पतति । परिविवाहयिषितः परिवाहयितुमिष्टः । हृषीकगणमिन्द्रियवर्गम् । सप्ततन्तुसाहायकेन यज्ञसहायत्वेन ।

Colophon :

इति कौशिककुलतिलकतातार्यसूनुश्रीनिवासार्यकृतिषु संकल्पसूर्योदयविवरणे अष्टमोऽङ्कः ।

This Commentary is identical with those contained in the MSS. described under D. No. 12717 of the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library and Nos. 4569 to 4571 (Vol. VIII) of the Tanjore Palace Library though the Madras Govt. MS. does not read the author's name and the Tanjore MSS. read it as Tātārya of Kaus'ika family. One S'rībhāṣya Srinivāsācarya of Kaus'ika family was well-known as the Commentator on many of the works of S'rī Vedāntadesika. But on lack of clear evidence we are not in a position to identify our author with him.

IV. *Vyākhyā* by Nṛsiṁharāja. This also is a good Commentary on the drama. There is a complete MS. in the Adyar Library.[1] The Commentary begins thus :

ब्रह्मतन्त्रयतीन्द्रोक्तरहस्यार्थविचक्षणम् ।
श्रीशैलताततनयमनन्तार्यमहं भजे ॥
भगवन्तमिवानन्तकल्याणगुणसागरम् ।
वेदान्तदेशिकं नौमि वेंकटेशगुरूत्तमम् ॥
संसाराख्यनिशीथसुप्ततनुभृत्संबोधनायाग्रणीः
सूरीणां स गुरुर्व्यधात्प्रकरणं संकल्पसूर्योदयम् ।

[1] MS. No. 39. A. 16. (2 Vols.) of the Adyar Library.

तत्रैतत्परिचिन्वतां स भगवत्संकल्पसूर्यो निशां
मायां भागवतीं विमोक्ष्य विमलां धत्ते दृशं शाश्वतीम् ॥
यत्र सर्वे गुणाः पूर्णा दोषो यत्र न कश्चन ।
व्याकुर्महे तं संकल्पसूर्योदयमनुत्तमम् ॥
वेदान्तदेशिकगिरां भावः केनावगम्यते ।
अथापि तद्दयाधारो व्याख्यास्यामि यथामति ॥

* * * * *

इह खलु वेदान्ताचार्यः सर्वजगत्प्रसिद्धः कवितार्किकसिंहापरगुणनामधेयः श्रीवेंकटेशगुरुसार्वभौमः संसारदवदहनदन्दह्यमानं सकलजनं विलोक्य करुणया दोदूयमानचेतास्त्रय्यन्तसुधारसपरिवाहेनाप्लावयिष्यन् कोमलबुद्धीनप्यनुजिघृक्षुः सर्वोपनिषत्सारार्थजातं संकल्पसूर्योदयाख्येन नाटकेन संगृह्य विवक्षुः

End :

श्रुतिपथे वेदमार्गे शितबुद्धयो वयं येषां शिष्यास्ते अस्मदाचार्याः । ये च नः शिष्या अस्मच्छिष्याः सन्ति । इदं नाटकं प्रबन्धरूपं वस्तु तत्संतोषसमर्पणक्षमं तदिदं परिपालयतीत्यर्थः । साडम्बरैरन्तःसारासत्त्वेऽपि बहिःसंभ्रमैः परैरितरैः किं प्रयोजनम् ।

श्रीमान् रामानुजार्योक्त्यमलसुरनदीपाविताशेषलोको
विद्यासंपन्निषद्या कविकथकघटामस्तकन्यस्तपादः ।
अव्याद्दिव्यैः प्रबन्धैः श्रुतिगहनगुहादीपमालासगन्धै-
र्वेदान्ताचार्यवर्यो गुणनिधिरिह मां सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्रः ॥

Colophon :

इति श्रीनृसिंहराजाचार्यविरचितसंकल्पसूर्योदयव्याख्यायां दशमोऽङ्कः समाप्तः ॥

From these passages it is understood that Nṛsiṁharāja was the author of this Commentary and he was the pupil of Anantārya who was the son of Tātācarya of S'ris'aila family and had some connection with the Parakāla Maṭh of Mysore. Another complete MS.

of the work is available in the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library (D. 12715). It is curious to note that all the colophons found in that MS. omit the author's name. The following remarks are written in the Catalogue of the Library: "Up to a portion of the sixth act this commentary agrees with that printed in Telugu characters under the name of Prabhāvali in the Conjeevaram Literary Institute Series, which is said to have been written by S'rinivāsa." Thus there has been longstanding confusion regarding the authorship of the commentary. If the colophons found in the Adyar Library MS. are considered to be genuine, we may take Nṛsiṁharāja as the author of the commentary; however, he may not be confounded with the author of the Sarvārthasiddivyākhyā Ānandadāyinī who also was called Nṛsiṁharāja.[1] The latter was the pupil of S'ribhāṣya S'rinivāsācārya of Kaus'ika family while the former seems to have been the disciple of Anantācārya of S'ris'aila family and son of S'ris'aila Tātācārya.

V. *Vyākhyā* by S'ribhāṣya Nārāyaṇasūri. This also is another commentary on the drama. There are two palm-leaf MSS. of the work, one in the Adyar Library (34. C. 27) and the other in the Madras Govt. Ori. MSS. Library (R. 3150). In the Adyar Library MS. the first leaf is much broken, otherwise acts 1 to 10 are complete. In the Govt. Library MS. the acts 2 to 7 are available. The Adyar Library MS. begins thus:

आञ्चि श्रीवेंकटाचार्य . . . . . . दासः । मदीयबुद्धिप्रसरस्य . . . . । इह खलु श्रीरङ्गराजदिव्याज्ञा . . . . . परमपुरुषचरणारविन्दविषयनिरतिशय . . . . . . सर्वतन्त्रसंकटप्रशमनविशङ्कटमतिः श्रीमान् वेंकटनाथो नाम कविः ।

Colophon:

इति यतिवरचरणसरोजभृङ्गायमाणाञ्चिवेंकटगुरुकृपालब्धश्रीभाष्यान्वयेन श्रीवत्सकुलतिलकश्रीनिवासार्यावरजेन श्रीभाष्यनारायणसूरिणा विरचितासु कृतिषु संकल्पसूर्योदयव्याख्याने सप्तमोऽङ्कः ।

[1] Mysore University Series No. 76.

From the Colophon quoted above it is known that the commentary was written by S'rībhāṣya Nārāyaṇasūri who was the disciple of Ācci Veṅkaṭācārya and younger brother of S'rīnivāsācarya of S'rī-Vatsa family. This commentary is different from those mentioned above. This author has written also a commentary on the *S'rīguṇaratnakos'a* of Parās'arabhatta.[1]

VI. *Vyākhyā by Nārāyaṇa.* This is another commentary on the drama. There is a palm leaf MS. of the work in the Govt. Oriental MSS. Library, Madras.[2] From the extracts given below the author is known to be one Nārāyaṇa of S'ri-Vatsa family, son of Hastigirinātha and pupil of Vādhūla Varadācarya and Vādhūla S'rīnivāsācārya. The MS. contains the first act only. It begins thus:

हृदयं दधातु सदयं यदूद्वहं शरणागतार्तिहरणाय दीक्षितम् ।
नवनीरदाभमवनीरजश्श्रयैः परिधूसराङ्गमवधूतकल्मषम ॥
जयति श्रीमहाचार्यो वेदान्तार्थप्रकाशकः ।
कुहनाबद्धसिद्धान्तश्रद्धाध्वान्तदिवाकरः ॥
वाधूलवरदाचार्यं विद्यासाम्राज्यदीक्षितम् ।
ऐहिकामुष्मिकार्थानां दातारमनिशं भजे ॥
वाधूलश्रीनिवासार्यकृपालब्धोपलब्धिना ।
वाधूलवरदाचार्यदयोपचितबुद्धिना ॥
ततः श्रुत्वैव संकल्पसूर्योदयसमाह्वयम् ।
नाटकं विदुषां प्रीत्यै विशदीक्रियते मया ॥
त्रय्यन्तदेशिकोक्तिः क्व क्व चाहमतिमन्दधीः ।
तथाप्यत्र प्रवेशो मे भेकस्येवोच्छ्रितोऽर्णवे ॥

इह खलु परमकारुणिको भगवान् वेदान्ताचार्यः श्रीरङ्गनाथस्वामिसेवाधुरंधरैः परमैकान्तिभिः ।

[1] R. No. 758 (a) of the Govt. Oriental MSS. Library, Madras.
[2] D. 14609 of the Govt. Oriental MSS. Library, Madras.

Colophon :

इति श्रीवाधूलवरदाचार्यकृपालब्धवेदवेदान्तालंकारविविधमार्गविज्ञानस्य श्रीवत्सकुलजन्मनो हस्तिगिरिनाथात्मजस्य श्रीमन्नारायणस्य कृतिषु संकल्प-सूर्योदयव्याख्याने प्रथमोऽङ्कः ।

As the author Nārāyaṇa was a disciple of Vādhūla S'rinivāsa and Vādhūla Varadācārya who were not remote to Vādhūla Mahācārya *alias* Doḍḍayācārya (1550 A.D.) he may be fixed in the later part of the 16th century A.D.

A NEW VERSION OF THE NĪTIDVIṢAṢṬIKĀ OF SUNDARAPĀṆḌYA

By H. G. NARAHARI

The *Nītidviṣaṣṭikā* of Sundarapāṇḍya is an old gnomic poem containing over one hundred verses designed to impart worldly wisdom. The poem was first published in 1928 in Madras under the editorship of Pandits P. Suryanarayana Tirtha and V. Prabhakara Sastri. Both the editors [1] as well as Mr. Ramakrishna Kavi [2] who contributes an English Preface to this edition, identify the author with his namesake, the Pre-S'aṅkara thinker who, according to the late Professor S. Kuppuswami Sastri [3] must have lived about c. 650 A. D. On the basis of additional evidence available to him, Mr. Ramakrishna Kavi[4] holds that Sundarapāṇḍya must have lived much earlier, earlier than even 6th cent. A. D.

[1] *Upodghāta*, pp. iii ff.
[2] *Preface*, pp. xi ff.
[3] *Journal of Oriental Research, Madras*, 1927, Vol. I, p. 11.
[4] *op. cit.*, p. xiii.

In the preparation of the *editio princeps* of the *Nītidviṣaṣṭikā* mentioned above, two MSS., we are told,[2] were used, one[1] belonging to the Govt. Oriental MSS. Library, Madras and the other to the Govt. Library at Trivandrum. A third MS. which should not have been available to those responsible for this edition is deposited in the Adyar Library with the shelf-number XXI. Q. 8. It is a palm-leaf manuscript written in Malayalam characters and consists of *six* folia. Size, 14″×1.9″. Lines, 11 in a page. The name of the poem is here given as *Sundarapāṇḍyaśataka*.. The colophon at the end of the codex runs ; *Iti sundarapāṇḍyaśatakaṁ samāptam.*

Compared with the printed version, the present MS. contains a good many variant readings and a number of additional verses. To make a complete collation including minor verbal changes which this MS. contains is foreign to my purpose at present when the chief object is to draw the attention of scholars interested in the subject to the existence of a variant version of this didactic poem. I record below the more important among the *varietas lectiones* :

1. For सद्भाषितरत्नानां in the printed edition (P.) (verse 3*a*) the present MS. reads सुभाषितसुरक्तानां.

2. Verses 14 and 15 in the P. are interchanged in the MS.

3. For मूर्खेषु कुशलमानिषु in the P. (verse 18*a*), we have मूर्खेष्वकुशलवादिषु in the MS.

4. Verses 25 and 26 in the P. are interchanged in the MS.

5. For तत्कारणवच्च जनवच्च in the P. (verse 28*d*), we have सत्कारविवर्जितश्च जनवच्च in the MS.

6. For the reading in P. (verse 31 *cd*) :

अप्यस्पष्टं वाक्यमनर्थं पूज्यं समृद्धस्य ।

[1] *Upodghāta*, pp. ix ff.

[2] Probably same as what is now D. 12051.

the MS. has:

अप्यस्पष्टमनर्थं वाक्यं ग्राह्यं समर्थस्य ।

7. After ख्याते ऽपि cett. in P. (verse 32), the following verses are found extra in the MS.:

वयसा वृद्धतरा अपि विद्यावृद्धं मनुष्यमुपगम्य ।
उपचारानतदेहा गुरुमिव पृच्छन्ति सन्देहम् ॥
परगुणतत्त्वग्रहणं स्वगुणनिरोधः परव्यसनमौनम् ।
मधुरम(?)[1] रं च वाक्यं केनाप्युपदिष्टमार्याणाम् ॥
किं द्रव्यैः किं विभवैः किं सारैर्विस्तरैर्नृणां तेषाम् ।
यन्नियमभाजनस्थं सन्तोषरसायनं पीतम् ॥
तुटिमात्रं तटिमात्रं मधु संभ्रियते यथा मधुकरीभिः ।
सततं संभ्रियमाणं तत्कुम्भशतानि पूरयति ॥
एवमुपचीयमानं स्तोकं स्तोकं विचिन्वतः पुण्यम् ।
संपद्यते विशालं श्रुतिमप्येवं तपो ऽप्येवम् ॥

8. For शिशिरेष्वसुखवासैः in P. (verse 34*c*), the MS. has शिशिरेष्वप्सु निवासैः ।

9. For the incorrect भवितव्यत् in P. (verse 36*d*), the MS. has the correct भवितव्यम्.

10. For P. (verse 37*bcd*):

श्रुतवन्तः शौर्यधैर्यसम्पन्नाः ।
नीचैस्तथा मिलन्ते यथा (किल न ?) विक्रियां यान्ति ॥

the MS. correspondingly has:

कुलजाः श्रुतशौर्यवीर्यसंपन्नाः ।
नीचैस्तथा क्रियन्ते यथावशा विक्रियां यान्ति ॥

[1] There is here a letter which looks like श or गि both of which are of no use.

11. For स्थिरसन्धीनां महानुभावानाम् in P. (verse 45*b*), the MS. has स्थिरबुद्धीनां परैरहार्याणाम .

12. For शस्त्राग्निविषप्रघातहृदयानाम् in P. (verse 46*b*), the MS. gives शस्त्राशीविषमानहृदयानाम् .

13. धिगस्तु ? बत in P. (verse 46*d*) has धिगस्तु खलु in the MS.

14. For कृतकृत्यस्त्वपवृत्तः in P. (verse 47*c*), the MS. has कृतकृत्यस्सपृक्तः ।

15. For श्वेतगिरिशिखरकेष्विव in P. (verse 50*c*), the MS. has निर्मलगिरिशिखरेष्विव.

16. The MS. has next the following extra verse:

पश्यन्ति गुणशतान्यपि पुरुषाणां निर्गुणेषु पुरुषेषु ।
अञ्जनगिरिशिखरेष्विव निशासु चन्द्रांशवः पतिताः ॥

17. For P. (verse 57):

सततप्रसरे विषये जितेन्द्रियत्वं च यदि भवेत्पुंसः ।
इह च न मनोऽभिघातः परत्र च (चिरं) सुखं भवति ॥

The MS. has:

नातः कल्याणकरं जितेन्द्रियत्वं यदि भवेत्पुंसः ।
इह च मनो निर्विण्णं परत्र चाप्यतिसुखं भवति ॥

18. After the verse पाषाणेष्विव रेखा (in P. No. 59), the MS. has two extra verses not found there.

कठिनत्वं गिरिषु सदा मृदुता सलिले प्रतापिता सूर्ये ।
वैरमसज्जनहृदये सज्जनहृदये सदा क्षान्तिः ॥ [1]
ह्रस्वं येषां वैरं मैत्री दीर्घा दया च भूतेषु ।
लोके सत्पुरुषास्ते तस्माद्वैरं प्रहातव्यम् ॥

[1] In a slightly varied form, this verse occurs as no. 11 in the *anubandha* attached to the printed edition.

19. For P. (verse 62 *cd*):

अप्रियमुक्त्वातिभृशं पश्चात्तपतीह खल्वार्यः ॥

the MS. has the version;

अप्रियमुक्त्वापि चिरं सुचिरं सन्तप्यते सुज (नः)[1] ॥

20. For परुषैरपि वाक्छल्यैः in P. (verse 65*a*), the MS. gives परुषैरपि रिपुवचनैः

21. In the MS. the second-half of verse न च हसति cett. (P. No. 75) and the first-half of verse पश्यति दीर्घं cett. (P. No. 76) are omitted, and the remaining portions form one verse.

22. For साधुप्रणयक्रियासु चाशक्तिः in P. (verse 81*b*), the MS. has सकलुषि परुषेषु या क्रियाशक्तिः

23. The verse दारैश्च सन्निकर्षो which occurs in P. (verse 89) is omitted by the MS.

24. For P. (verse 90 *ab*):

पक्षद्वयशशिसदृशान्यनिशं हार्दानि सदसतां लोके ।

the MS. has;

चन्द्रोपमानि सौहृदानि नित्यमसतां सतां चैव ।

25. After the verse यो न ददाति (in P, verse 99), the following additional verse occurs in the MS.:

दानं भोगं च विधानवत्तामात्रकेण यदि धनिनः ।
वयमपि किमति न धनिनः तिष्ठति नः काञ्चनो मेरुः ॥

26. For P. (verse 101 *ab*):

अतिकुपिता अपि सुजना योगेन मृदूभवन्ति न तु नीचाः ।

the MS. gives:

कुपिता अपि ते सन्तो दानैर्मृदवो भवन्ति न तु नीचाः ।

[1] This letter is not clear in the MS.

27. For अफलं श्राद्धमपात्रे in P. (verse 110*a*), the MS. has अफलं चान्नमभुक्तं .

28. There is the following verse extra in the MS. after परमर्मघट्टनादौ cett. (in P. verse 112):

यौवनमज्ञानसुखं पुंसामुन्मादयेन्न तन्नाम ।
स्वयमपि नटः पिशाचो लब्ध्वा पटहा न किं नटति ॥

29. After the verse आरोग्यं cett. (in P. verse 114), the MS has the following additional verse ;

धत्ते यः कुलधर्मं कुलधर्मार्जित(नोऽन्तरे?) सुदृढम् ।
कर्तव्यो बहिरङ्गस्तानि च विदुषान्तरङ्गविधिः ॥

30. After the verse इमां काञ्चनपीठस्थां cett. (in P. verse 116), P. concludes इति श्रीसुन्दरपाण्ड्यकृता नीतिद्विषष्टिका ; but the MS. has one more verse and a different colophon also:

विद्या हृद्या विनयं च सद्भिराचरितम् ।
येषामेषा भूषा तेषां निजभवनमखिलं त्रिभुवनम् ॥

इति सुन्दरपाण्ड्यशतकं समाप्तम्

OBITUARY NOTICE

RT. HON. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI

(22-9-1869 to 17-4-1946)

THE RT. HON. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI passed away at night on Thursday the 17th April, 1946 at 10-35 when he was in his 77th year. Born of an orthodox Brahmin family in the village of Valangiman in the Tanjore District of the Madras Presidency, he had a brilliant educational career and started life as a school-master, later taking up the position as Head-master in the Hindu High School at Triplicane in the Madras City. In 1907, he joined the Servants of India Society, started by the late G. K. Gokhale at that time, and became its second President on the death of Gokhale. After nearly 30 years of active political life during which he played a conspicuous part in Indian imperial and international affairs, he returned to academic life accepting the Vice-Chancellorship of the Annamalai University in 1935. He remained in that position for a little over five years. He had been taking keen interest in Sanskrit, had a good knowledge of the language and a deep understanding of its literature. *Rāmāyaṇa* was his favourite. Recently he delivered a course of lectures on that subject, explaining its permanent values in the life of man. He was elected President of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Madras, when that was founded about two years ago. In him, public speaking developed as a polished art; with chaste and faultless language, elegant style, apt words, sweet voice, with an attractive personality in robes donned with meticulous care, and with an effortless delivery, he thrilled the audiences from many a platform in the various countries of the world, both at public meetings and at international gatherings.

REVIEWS

Sukthankar Memorial Edition; Vol. I—Critical Studies in the Mahābhārata, Vol. II—Analecta; Karnatak Publishing House, Bombay.

These two volumes containing the literary contributions of the late Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, were published on the 21st of January, 1944 and 21st of January, 1945 respectively, which were the first and the second anniversary days of the premature demise of that great scholar. They are priced Rs. 15 and Rs. 20 respectively. The first volume includes the Foreword which he added to the first fascicule of the *Ādiparvan* of the Critical Edition of the *Mahābhārata* undertaken by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, issued in 1927, followed by his Prolegomena added to the *Ādiparvan* in 1933 and the Introduction added to the *Āraṇyakaparvan* in 1942. There are, then, eight Papers under the heading, "Epic Studies," two Papers on "Arjunamiśra" and "Nala Episode and the Rāmāyaṇa," two Papers dealing with two Epic Questions and two statements regarding the progress of the Critical Edition of the *Mahābhārata*, made on the occasions of the publication of the *Udyogaparvan* in 1940 and of the *Āraṇyakaparvan* in 1943.

The second volume contains his contributions on a variety of subjects, namely, the Grammar of Śākaṭāyana in two parts, seven Papers on Bhāsa, twelve Epigraphical Studies, eleven miscellaneous Papers and an English version of Bhāsa's *Svapnavāsavadatta*. At the end of the volume is added a Note on Dr. Sukthankar and his contribution to Indology by Dr. S. M. Katre.

From August 1925, Dr. Sukthankar was the editor of the *Mahābhārata* in the Bhandarkar Institute, and he continued in that capacity for over seventeen years until his death early in 1943. He took a very prominent part in the celebration of the Silver Jubilee of the Institute in the first week of January 1943, and

within a fortnight, he passed away. An obituary notice about him appeared in this Bulletin in February 1943. He was nearly fifty-six years old at the time of passing away; and he looked much younger, was very fresh and healthy and kept himself quite fit. I still remember meeting him at Poona on the occasion of the Silver Jubilee celebration of the Bhandarkar Institute; and when I jokingly addressed him as "you young man," he turned back and asked me "what do *you* mean by addressing me as a young man?" I was really surprised when it was found that he was so much older than myself. He was full of energy and enthusiasm and he was always active. No one thought that he would be called away so soon from this world where such men are rare and such men are badly wanted.

The two volumes now before the public bear ample testimony to his conspicuous abilities as a scholar and as a research-worker. The width of the regions traversed by him is immeasurable. The depth to which he dived in his studies and in his researches is imponderable. The variety of the topics in which he laid his hands is another very remarkable feature in his literary activities. But he was not a mere trotter over wide areas. He was comprehensive in his general outlook, and at the same time precise and full in his details. His *miscellanea* will show the extent of his interest. Notes on Kāvyaprakāśa, The Assyrian Tablet found in Bombay, Curiosities of Hindu Epigraphy, Oldest Hindu Drama, Linguistic Studies in India—what a variety! His contribution on the subject of *Mahābhārata*, comprised in the first volume, clearly shows what painstaking labour he was capable of, with what care he compared manuscripts, collected details and examined facts.

He never let things take their own course. When he took up a work, he applied himself studiously to it, collected all the relevant materials and mastered the subject thoroughly. He was a student of mathematics, and his mathematical training helped him much in his researches. The *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali, the critical studies on Pāṇini by Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita and the analysis of logical details by Gadādhara show that what is called "Research" is no new invention

in a foreign country introduced into this land; to this extent Dr. Sukthankar continued the traditions of real Indian scholarship.

The *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upaniṣads* were the earliest attempts in India, so far as literary records go, to interpret and understand the Vedas. The next great attempt in that direction in India is recorded in the *Mahābhārata*, perhaps two or three thousand years after the age of the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upaniṣads*. Now, after the lapse of a similar period, there appear again the activities of a band of scholars in India to study and explain the civilization of the Vedas in its passage through the various epochs, both directly and also by its interpretation of ancient days contained in the *Mahābhārata* and the dependent literature. In this renaissance of Vedic civilization in India in this century, the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute has made a great contribution through the undertaking of the critical edition of the *Mahābhārata*. In planning this stupendous structure and in carrying out a major portion of the actual work, the great share of the credit goes to Dr. Sukthankar. The first volume now under review will go down to posterity as one of the richest heritages from the present age. The second volume will ever remain memorable for the wide scholarship and profound learning evinced in it. *Sukthankar est mort; vive Sukthankar.*

EDITOR

Ganga Oriental Series, Bikaner.

1. *Jagadvijayacchandas* edited by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja; No. 2, 1945; Pp. 57 + 163.

2. *Mudrārākṣasapūrvasankathānaka* edited by Dr. Dasharatha Sharma: No. 3, 1945; Pp. 20 + 14 + 58.

The present reviewer is often tempted to compare Sanskrit literature with an iceberg. It seems that, like an iceberg, only a small portion of the vast Sanskrit literature is visible to us while a major portion of it perhaps still remains buried among the manuscript-collections, which are scattered all over this country. Modern

research in the field of Sanskrit studies in India is characterised by the vigorous efforts which are being made to organise those manuscript-collections on proper scientific lines, and thus afford opportunities to scholars to examine them carefully and to resurrect from them literary gems which would otherwise have been, for ever, lost to us. A notable effort in this direction has been recently made by the Bikaner Durbar through the foundation of the Anup Sanskrit Library and the publication of the Ganga Oriental Series. The credit for this new academic enterprise belongs to the illustrious ruler of Bikaner, to his enlightened Prime Minister, Sardar Panikkar and to the principal organiser of the library and the Series, Dr. C. Kunhan Raja. Two new volumes have been published in the Series during the course of the last few months.

Jagadvijayacchandas, which is now edited and published for the first time, belongs to a rare form of Sanskrit Literature. It consists exclusively of a series of rhyming vocatives arranged in the *Daṇḍaka* metre. It appears that each rhyming unit was intended to be pronounced to the accompaniment of a beat of a drum. In the present edition, Dr. Raja gives the text of the work in two recensions—one long and the other short. Out of these two, only the longer text is properly edited together with a commentary, while a readable presentation of the shorter text and its commentary is given in Appendix I. Besides these, in Appendix II and III, the long and the short texts are respectively given in a continuous manner without commentaries. For all this, the editor has used four manuscripts from the Anup Sanskrit Library, corresponding to the main portion of the edition and the three appendices. All the manuscript variants in the case of the longer text are given in the notes which follow the appendices. It is hardly necessary to add that all this editing work has been done with great care and precision, as may be expected of an editor of Dr. Raja's standing and experience.

The song itself possesses little poetic beauty. The main interest of the *Jagadvijayacchandas*, however, seems to lie in two things. Firstly, in the work, the author has used words in a variety

of meanings, most of which are rare and obscure. As a matter of fact, without the commentary, this work would have remained, to a great extent, ununderstandable. The commentator explains all the relevant senses of such words clearly and, in the course of his explanations, he refers from time to time, to the *Sūtras* of Pāṇini and to lexicons like Amara and Vis'va. Most of these references are carefully traced to their original sources by the editor. The importance of the *Jagadvijayacchandas* from the point of view of Sanskrit vocabulary is quite patent. The editor has fully realised this. He has therefore given at the end of the book, a complete index of all the words together with their different meanings. The various Sanskrit roots with different meanings are taken up, and nominal forms are derived from them through various grammatical processes. Similarly several words given in early lexicons are found actually used in this work, in their various senses. The *Jagadvijayacchandas* may thus be properly regarded as a text on applied lexicography.

The second point of interest regarding this work is its authorship and its historical associations. In the absence of any positive evidence, the editor has evolved, out of a large number of stray indications, a tentative theory, which he claims to be fairly reliable, that the author of this work is the great poet Kavīndrācārya of Benares, who was patronised by the Moghul Emperors Jahangir and Shah Jahan, and also by several other Indian princes. The editor further claims that the work contains a panegyric of the Emperor Jahangir. In his Introduction, the editor has dealt with these two matters at length; but the impression which that discussion seems to leave on the mind of a critical reader is that, until corroborated by other more direct and objective evidence, the theory so ably propounded by Dr. Raja must be regarded only as a basis for further investigation. Special mention must here be made of Prof. P. K. Gode's highly informative Paper on "Some Evidence about the Location of the Manuscript Library of Kavīndrācārya Sarasvati at Benares in A.D. 1665," which is fittingly given after the Introduction.

Mudrārāksasapūrvasaṅkathānaka: Among the very few historical dramas in Sanskrit, the *Mudrārākṣasa* by Vis'ākhadatta is perhaps the most popular. But the plot of the *Mudrārākṣasa* is highly complicated, as may be expected of a drama in which Cāṇakya plays a prominent rôle. The drama as a whole, therefore, suffers considerably in dramatic interest. Several items in the story, as it is presented in the play, require elucidation. In many respects the development of the plot becomes ununderstandable. From early times, therefore, Sanskrit writers have found it necessary to provide suitable introductions dealing with the events leading to the plot of the drama. Three such versions of the *Pūrvasaṅkathānaka* of *Mudrārākṣasa* by Mahādeva, Ravinartaka and Dhuṇḍirāja were hitherto known to students of Sanskrit Literature. Two more versions are now made available to us by Dr. Dasharatha Sharma in the Ganga Oriental Series No. 3, though the title-page of the volume gives the wrong impression that only one version is therein included.

Ananta is the author of one of the two versions called *Mudrārākṣasapūrvasaṅkathānaka*, while the name of the author of the other version, which is called *Mudrārākṣasanāṭakapūrvapīṭhikā* and which is given in the appendix, is not known. The text of the *Pūrvasaṅkathānaka* is based on two manuscripts and is carefully edited by Dr. Sharma. For the sake of clear understanding, he has divided the text into paragraphs and has introduced modern punctuation. The text of the *Pūrvapīṭhikā* has been restored from only one manuscript which was available in the Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner. In an informative Introduction, Dr. Sharma gives a summary of the two works edited by him and a brief account of Ananta, the author of the *Pūrvasaṅkathānaka*. As a piece of literary art, Ananta's work may be said to possess moderate literary merit. It is obviously written in imitation of the conventional prose style of Daṇḍin and Bāṇa. The family to which Ananta belonged hails from Puṇyastamba (Punatambe in the Ahmednagar District of the Bombay Presidency) and has produced many eminent Sanskrit writers, and Prof. P. K. Gode's

Paper on the subject will be eagerly awaited by the students of Sanskrit literature.

So far as the editing of the two works is concerned it leaves little to be desired and Dr. Sharma deserves to be congratulated on it. It may, however, be suggested that, in order to facilitate reference, the variant readings should have been given in relevant foot-notes rather than at the end of the work. It may also be suggested in this connection that the organisers of the Ganga Oriental Series would do well to use proper diacritical marks in their publications.

Apart from the importance of the *Pūrvasaṅkathānaka* as a very necessary aid for the proper understanding of the development of the plot of the *Mudrārākṣasa*, we have also to evaluate its historical importance. Dr. Sharma has tried to do so in his Introduction. Sardar Panikkar also has referred to this point in his Foreword. On a comparison of the account given in the *Pūrvasaṅkathānaka* with other available historical material regarding the times of the Mauryas, one feels inclined to conclude that the *Pūrvasaṅkathānaka* can hardly be regarded as a source-book of any value for the reconstruction of the history of the rise of the Mauryas.

R. N. D.

Highways and Byways of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit by Mahamahopadhyaya Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri, M.A., I.E.S. Published by the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Madras; 1945. Price Rs. 2.

This book contains lectures delivered by the late Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri under the auspices of the Annamalai University on the 23rd to the 26th of January in 1931. They are now issued as a posthumous publication in the form of a small volume of 78 pages of text-matter followed by an index of Sanskrit passages cited, of authors and works referred to, both in Sanskrit and in English, and of subjects dealt with in the lectures. In the

first lecture the learned author has dealt with the synthesis of the poet and the critic and has clearly shown that a critic should himself be a poet and that literary criticism is as much an art as poetry itself. There is no word in Sanskrit for "critic." Even a word like *vimarśaka* means something different from "critic." The word in Sanskrit is *sahṛdaya*, one who has a heart in common with the poet, one who feels with the poet. In the second lecture, the problem of the relation of law and freedom in art is dealt with. The third lecture is devoted to a clear exposition of *Vyañjanā*, and in the fourth and last lecture an attempt is made to show how *Vyañjanā* is the Highway in Sanskrit literary criticism and how the paths in literary criticism like *Guṇa, Rīti* and *Alaṅkāra* are byways connected to the highway of *Vyañjanā*. There is a brief Foreword from the pen of the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, the President of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute.

Professor Kuppuswami Sastri has made a special study of Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyāloka*, of which a correct and dependable edition is not available yet. He has edited the first of the four *Udyotas* with the *Locana* of Abhinavagupta and the *Kaumudī* on *Locana* by Udaya, along with his own occasional gloss called *Upalocana* (reviewed in this Bulletin in October, 1945). He could not continue and complete the edition. He had occasion to teach the *Dhvanyāloka* to advanced students on many occasions. *Dhvanyāloka* was his great pet. He was fully qualified to give an exposition of the doctrine of literary criticism developed in that great work.

Earlier writers on literary criticism dealt with the subject in a formal way. To them, poetry could be divided into language and theme, and they dealt with the three elements in both, namely, *Guṇa, Doṣa* and *Alaṅkāra*. It was Ānandavardhana who first propounded the doctrine of *Dhvani* or *Vyañjanā* being the real essence of art. When we speak, the sounds that form the language produce the impressions of some objects in us. Sounds handled in a particular way produce a secondary impression on us, besides the bare primary meanings; and it is this secondary impression that

forms the art-content in poetry. The primary meanings of words and words themselves have the same relation to this secondary meaning, the art-content of poetry, which words have to a sentence or which a lamp has to light. They are there as inevitable accompaniments. But they do not form the art.

S'aṅkarācārya has risen to philosophical heights from which ordinary thinkers, looking down, would feel giddy. His contribution to philosophical thoughts has been well recognised throughout the world. But here is another region in which human genius has risen to giddy heights, in India, heights to which workers of that field in other countries have not yet made any near approach. This is the field of literary criticism. Just as S'aṅkarācārya discusses what he declares to be beyond discussion, Ānandavardhana analyses what he declares to be incapable of formal analysis. Thus one gets an impression that he too has followed the path of formal analysis in literary criticism. Literary criticism is a direct experience of art by an artist, and cannot be a formal elaboration of a theory, an application of standards to a set of facts, a judgment on a work with some codes to guide. But, just as in S'aṅkara, there is a fundamental doctrine besides his arguments, similarly in Ānandavardhana too, there is an element of the doctrine of the transcendent nature of art besides all the rules he enunciates. Professor Sastriar has successfully elucidated the fundamental doctrine of literary criticism which Ānandavardhana teaches, and he has shown its eminence in the field of literary criticism in relation to the other modes of approach to evaluate poetic art. He has drawn attention to the three fundamental factors, namely, the poet-critic equation, the law-freedom reconciliation and the transcendent nature of aesthetic experience. On many minor details introduced in the book there may be scope for differences of opinion, and the present reviewer himself does not see eye to eye with the author on many details.

The true doctrine of the enjoyment of poetic art as developed in India with reference to Sanskrit literature has not been till now properly interpreted to the modern world. The present is a good

introduction of the subject to the literary men of modern times. I quote the closing words of the Foreword as the most appropriate way to indicate what the value of the work is: "Enter here, you shall have reward you never dreamt of."

EDITOR

Rājasthāni Vīra-Gīta, part I.

The first volume of the Sādūḷa Prāchya Granthamālā, published by the Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner, is an anthology of old Rājasthānī bardic songs consisting of the text of 141 songs from the twelfth century A.D. up to modern times together with several useful indexes of the names of royal heroes immortalised by these ballads and of their bardic composers. We are promised that in Part II of the volume which will follow, there will be a copious introduction, a running translation, biographical notes and a glossary. This compilation of songs in the Dingal language possesses both historical and literary interest. As the editor explains, *Gīta* is a technical term denoting a kind of metrical composition in the prosody of the Rājasthānī literature. It has been a very favourite medium of literary expression in Rajputana, embodying in a most passionate way the popular reaction to the heroic achievements of a particular historical character. It appears that there are many old collections of bardic songs still existing in manuscript-form and, if properly edited, these would constitute a valuable source for studying the development of the language. In the present collection there is that well-known *Gīta* of Pṛthvīrāja and Mahārāṇa Pratāpa. There is also a new song devoted to S'ivāji composed by a Jain poet Upādhyāya Dharmavardhana. The following 2 stanzas of this song are surprisingly in the same ringing tone as the stanzas of Bhūṣaṇa, the great court poet of S'ivāji:

सकति काइ साधना किना निज भुज सकति वडा गढ धूणिया वीर वांकै ।
अवर उमराव कुण आइ सामौ अडै सिवा'री धाक पतिसाह सांकै ॥

खसर करता तिके असर सहु खूंदिया जीविया तिके त्रिणो लेइ जीहै ।
सबद आवाज सिवराज री सांभळे बिली जिम दिलीरो धणीं बीहै ॥ (p. 135)

It is regrettable that the phonetic distinction between व and व़ has not been shown in the typography of the book. In future, the State Press should be expected to arrange for special types for peculiar Rājasthāni sounds. As there is no etymological dictionary of the Dingal language, it would be very useful if, in Part II, a complete glossary of the words in the present text is etymologically treated. It would have also added to the usefulness of the volume if the dates or centuries of the poets and of the songs would have been indicated in a line at the top of each song, instead of being reserved for Part II. The volume, when complete in both parts, would be a respectable inauguration of the series associated with the name of His present Highness the Maharaja Sadul Singhji of Bikaner.

V. S. AGRAWALA

B. C. Law Volume, Part I, edited by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar and others; Indian Research Institute, Calcutta, 1945; xxxix, 705; Price, not stated.

I think that, from the point of view of the man of letters, the century we now live in may well be called, in India, the century of conferences and commemoration volumes. During the last few decades that have passed, numerous literary associations have been formed, and a good many scholars have been presented with volumes of studies in appreciation of their great scholarship. Dr. B. C. Law in whose honour the present volume has been got up, is a great scholar whose literary endeavours cover several aspects of Indology like Buddhism, Jainism, Ancient Indian History, Geography and Archaeology. Wealth and learning seldom go together, and the greatest geniuses in the world are known to be also the poorest of humanity. Fortune has been kind enough to confer wealth on Dr. Law and, along with it, happily we learn, a very

charitable disposition. It is only right that a man with so many "good parts" should be honoured by his countrymen.

The book under review is only the *first* part of the *Festschrift* proposed for Dr. Law. It contains 66 articles. Among its contributors are some of the best known writers of the East as well as the West. In a review like this it is not possible to evaluate each single article in the Volume. I can refer, and that too very briefly, only to the more important of the contributions. The Marquis of Zetland's "musings" on *Homo Sapiens* is an eloquent appeal for the recognition of the higher values of life. If "relations of eye-witnesses" can be the most satisfactory basis on which to build reliable history, Sir Jadunath Sarkar points out that there are ample documents in English and French, Persian and Marāṭhi, from which the strict historian can deduce accurate information concerning the happenings in India during the middle of the 17th cent. A. D. and thereafter. Prof. K. A. Nilakantha Sastri makes a critical study of Sekkiḷār's account of the disputation between the Tamil saint Sambandar and the Buddhists. Mr. Fachow gives an account of the Chinese translations of the Buddhist Tripiṭakas. In his Pāli article *Kiṁvādi Sammāsambuddho*, the Rev. A. P. Buddhadatta of Ceylon attempts to determine what the Buddha himself must have said concerning the religion which goes after his name. Mr. P. K. Gode's interesting study concerning the antiquity of *Jawār* or *Jondhla* reveals that this plant has a history dating as far back as B. C. 2000. Ancient Indian contributions to Botany are so little known that none can be too thankful to Mr. Gode for his thorough and painstaking investigations on the rather dull field of chronology which very frequently yield, as in the present case, very interesting and valuable information. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar lays bare the fact that, though in the 12th cent. A. D. and thereafter, the Hindu woman lost many of her privileges, till the end of the 8th century A. D. at least she enjoyed a high position in life. Regarded as equal to man, she not only performed sacrifices but even ruled over kingdoms, with her husband. Dr. R. N. Dandekar studies the Vedic Yama from the standpoint of 'evolutionary' mythology.

Writing on *Dvārakā*, one of the seven sacred places in India, Dr. A. D. Pusalker feels that there is nothing to controvert tradition which identifies modern Dwarka with the old capital of S'rī Kṛṣṇa. The poets of Malabar have composed a good many *sandes'akāvyas* in imitation of Kālidāsa's *Meghasandes'a*. Many of these are rich, not only in poetic beauty, but even in geographical information. Dr. C. Kunhan Raja gives a brief description of these poems and discusses their bearing on the geography of Malabar. Dr. T. M. P. Mahadevan's *Ajātivāda of Gauḍapāda* is a very good account of the philosophy of this ancient and important exponent of Advaita. *Anent* the dispute as to which religion touched *Āndhrades'a* earlier, Jainism or Buddhism, Mr. V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar points out that Buddhism in this province can be traced as far back as the 3rd century B. C., if not earlier. The late A. B. Keith discusses the relation of the work of Megasthenes to the *Arthas'āstra*, and shows that some facts mentioned by Megasthenes are not in accord with those of Kauṭilya. Read with Dr. Radhakumud Mookerjee's recent *Chandragupta Maurya and His Times* where cases of agreement between the two works are noted, it should be possible to have an accurate idea concerning the exact relationship between the records of Megasthenes, Arrian, Diodorus and Strabo on the one hand, and the *Arthas'āstra* of Kauṭilya on the other.

There are a few misprints here and there which can easily be corrected. On the whole, this is one of the best presentation volumes produced in recent times. We await the coming of the other part of the Volume with eager interest.

H. G. NARAHARI

Printed and Published by C. Subbarayudu, at the Vasanta Press, The Theosophical Society Adyar, Madras P. I. C. No. 85—19-4-1946

THE UNITY UNDERLYING ALL RELIGIONS

BY ANNIE BESANT

Reprinted with Acknowledgments to the Editor of "Lucifer" [1]

RIGHT thought is necessary to right conduct, right understanding to right living, and the Divine Wisdom—whether called by its ancient Sanskrit name of Brahma Vidyā, or its modern Greek name of Theosophia, Theosophy—comes to the world as at once an adequate philosophy and an all-embracing religion and ethic. It was once said of the Christian Scriptures by a devotee that they contained shallows in which a child could wade and depths in which a giant must swim. A similar statement might be made of Theosophy, for some of its teachings are so simple and so practical that any person of average intelligence can understand and follow them, while others are so lofty, so profound, that the ablest strains his intellect to contain them and sinks exhausted in the effort.[2]

[1] *Lucifer*, V. 18, pp. 404, 482.

[2] In the present volume an attempt will be made to place Theosophy before the reader simply and clearly, in a way which shall convey its general principles and truths as forming a coherent conception of the universe, and shall give such detail as is necessary for the understanding of their relations to each other. An elementary text-book cannot pretend to give the fulness of knowledge that may be obtained from abstruser works, but it should leave the student with clear fundamental ideas on his subject, with much indeed to add by future study but with little to unlearn. Into the outline given by such a book the student should be able to paint the details of further research. (Paragraph added when this article appeared later as an Introduction to *Ancient Wisdom*.)

It is admitted on all hands that a survey of the great religions of the world shows that they hold in common many religious, ethical, and philosophical ideas. But while the fact is universally granted, the explanation of the fact is a matter of dispute. Some allege that religions have grown up on the soil of human ignorance tilled by imagination, and have been gradually elaborated from crude forms of animism and fetichism; their likenesses are referred to universal natural phenomena imperfectly observed and fancifully explained, solar and star worship being the universal key for one school, phallic worship the equally universal key for another; fear, desire, ignorance, and wonder led the savage to personify the powers of nature, and priests played upon his terrors and his hopes, his misty fancies, and his bewildered questioning; myths became scriptures and symbols facts, and as their basis was universal the likeness of the products was inevitable. Thus speak the doctors of "Comparative Mythology," and plain people are silenced but not convinced under the rain of proofs; they cannot deny the likenesses, but they dimly feel: Are all man's dearest hopes and loftiest imaginings really nothing more than the outcome of savage fancies and of groping ignorance; have the great leaders of the race, the martyrs and heroes of humanity, lived, wrought, suffered, and died deluded by mere personifications of astronomical facts and by the draped obscenities of barbarians?

The second explanation of the common property in the religions of the world asserts the existence of an original teaching in the custody of a Brotherhood of great spiritual Teachers, who—themselves the outcome of past cycles of evolution—acted as the instructors and guides of the child-humanity of our planet, imparting to its races and nations in turn the fundamental truths of religion in the form most

adapted to the idiosyncrasies of the recipients. According to this view, the Founders of the great religions are members of the one Brotherhood, and were aided in their mission by many other members, lower in degree than themselves, initiates and disciples of various grades, eminent in spiritual insight, in philosophic knowledge, or in purity of ethical wisdom. These guided the infant nations, gave them their polity, enacted their laws, ruled them as kings, taught them as philosophers, guided them as priests; all the nations of antiquity looked back to such mighty men, demi-gods and heroes, and they left their traces in literature, in architecture, in legislation.

That such men lived it seems difficult to deny in the face of universal tradition, of still existing scriptures, and of prehistoric remains for the most part now in ruins, to say nothing of other testimony which the ignorant would reject. The sacred books of the East are the best evidence for the greatness of their authors, for who in later days or in modern times can even approach the spiritual sublimity of their religious thought, the intellectual splendour of their philosophy, the breadth and purity of their ethic? And when we find that these books contain teachings about God, man, and the universe, identical in substance under much variety of outer appearance, it does not seem unreasonable to refer them to a central primary body of doctrine; to that we give the name of the Divine Wisdom—in its Greek form: THEOSOPHY.

As the origin and basis of all religions, it cannot be the antagonist of any; it is indeed their purifier, revealing the valuable inner meaning of much that has become mischievous in its external presentation by the perverseness of ignorance and the accretions of superstition, but it recognizes and defends itself in each and seeks in each to unveil its hidden

wisdom. No man in becoming a Theosophist need cease to be a Christian, a Buddhist, a Hindu; he will acquire a deeper insight into his own faith, a firmer hold on its spiritual truths, a broader understanding of its sacred teachings. As Theosophy of old gave birth to religions, so in modern times does it justify and defend them. It is the rock whence all of them were hewn, the hole of the pit whence all were digged.

The truth of this statement becomes more and more apparent as we study the various world-scriptures, and but a few selections from the wealth of material available will be sufficient to establish the fact and to guide the student in his search for further verification. The main spiritual verities of religion may be summarized as:

i. One eternal infinite incognizable real Existence.

ii. From That the manifested God, unfolding from unity to duality, from duality to trinity.

iii. From the manifested Trinity many spiritual Intelligences, guiding the cosmic order.

iv. Man a reflexion of the manifested God and therefore a trinity fundamentally, his inner and real Self being eternal, one with the Self of the universe.

v. His evolution by repeated incarnations, into which he is drawn by desire, and from which he is set free by knowledge and sacrifice, becoming divine in potency as he had ever been divine in latency.

China, with its now fossilized civilization, was peopled in old days by the Turanians, the fourth sub-division of the great Fourth Race, the race which inhabited the lost continent of Atlantis and spread its off-shoots over the world. The Mongolians, the last subdivision of that same race, later re-inforced its population, so that we have in China traditions from ancient days, preceding the settlement of the Fifth, or

Aryan, race in India. In the *Khing Kang King* or *Classic of Purity*, we have a fragment of an ancient scripture of singular beauty, breathing out the spirit of restfulness and peace so characteristic of the "original teaching." Mr. Legge says in the introductory note to his translation[1] that the treatise:

> Is attributed to Ko Yüan (or Hsüan), a Tāoist of the Wū dynasty (A.D. 222-227), who is fabled to have attained to the state of an Immortal, and is generally so denominated. He is represented as a worker of miracles: as addicted to intemperance, and very eccentric in his ways. When shipwrecked on one occasion, he emerged from beneath the water with his clothes unwet, and walked freely on its surface. Finally he ascended to the sky in bright day. All these accounts may safely be put down as the figments of a later time.

Such stories are repeatedly told of Initiates of various degrees and are by no means necessarily "figments," but we are more interested in Ko Yüan's own account of the book:

> When I obtained the True Tāo, I had recited this King [book] ten thousand times. It is what the Spirits of heaven practise and had not been communicated to scholars of this lower world. I got it from the Divine Ruler of the Eastern Hwa; he received it from the Divine Ruler of the Golden Gate; he received it from the Royal-mother of the West.

Now the "Divine Ruler of the Golden Gate" was the title held by the Initiate who ruled the Toltec empire in Atlantis, and its use suggests that the *Classic of Purity* was brought thence to China when the Turanians separated off from the Toltecs. The idea is strengthened by the contents of the brief treatise, which deals with Tāo, literally "the Way"—the name by which the One Reality is indicated in the ancient Turanian and Mongolian religion. We read:

> The Great Tāo has no bodily form, but It produced and nourishes heaven and earth. The Great Tāo has no passions, but

[1] *The Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. xl.

It causes the sun and moon to revolve as they do. The Great Tāo has no name, but It effects the growth and maintenance of all things (i. 1.)

This is the manifested God as unity, but duality supervenes:

> Now the Tāo (shows itself in two forms), the Pure and the Turbid, and has (the two conditions of) motion and Rest. Heaven is pure and earth is turbid; heaven moves and the earth is at rest. The masculine is pure and the feminine is turbid; the masculine moves and the feminine is still. The radical (Purity) descended, and the (turbid) issue flowed abroad and thus all things were produced (i. 2).

This passage is particularly interesting from the allusion to the active and receptive sides of nature, the distinction between Spirit, the generator, and Matter, the nourisher, so familiar in later writings.

In the *Tāo Teh King* the teaching as to the Unmanifested and the Manifested comes out very plainly:

> The Tāo that can be trodden is not the enduring and unchanging Tāo. The name that can be named is not the enduring and unchanging name. Having no name, it is the Originator of heaven and earth; having a name it is Mother of all things . . . . Under these two aspects it is really the same; but as development takes place it receives the different names. Together we call them the Mystery (i, 1, 2, 4).

Students of the Kabalah will be reminded of one of the Divine Names, "the Concealed Mystery." Again:

> There was something undefined and complete, coming into existence before heaven and earth. How still it was and formless, standing alone and undergoing no change, reaching everywhere and in no danger (of being exhausted). It may be regarded as the Mother of all things. I do not know its name, and I give it the designation of the Tāo. Making an effort to give it a name I call it the Great. Great, it passes on (in constant flow). Passing on it becomes remote. Having become remote it returns (xxv. 1-3).

Very interesting is it to see here the idea of the forthgoing and the returning of the One Life, so familiar to us in Hindu literature. Familiar also seems the verse:

> All things under heaven sprang from It as existent (and named); that existence sprang from It as non-existent (and not named) (xl. 2).

That a universe might become, the Unmanifest must give forth the One from whom duality and trinity proceed:

> The Tāo produced One; One produced Two; Two produced Three; Three produced all things. All things leave behind them the Obscurity (out of which they have come), and go forward to embrace the Brightness (into which they have emerged), while they are harmonised by the Breath of Vacancy (xlii. 1).

"Breath of Space" would be a happier translation. Since all is produced from It, It exists in all:

> All-pervading is the great Tāo. It may be found on the left-hand and on the right . . . . It clothes all things as with a garment, and makes no assumption of being their lord; It may be named in the smallest things. All things return (to their root and disappear), and do not know that it is It which presides over their doing so;—It may be named in the greatest things (xxxiv. 1, 2).

Kwang-ȝe (fourth century B. C.) in his presentation of the ancient teachings, refers to the spiritual Intelligences coming from the Tāo:

> It has Its root and ground (of existence) in Itself. Before there were heaven and earth, from of old, there It was, securely existing. From It came the mysterious existence of spirits, from It the mysterious existence of God (Bk. vi. Pt. i. Sec. vi. 7).

A number of the names of these Intelligences follow, but such beings are so well known to play a great part in the Chinese religions that we need not multiply quotations about them.

Man is regarded as a trinity, Tāoism, says Mr. Legge, recognizing in him the spirit, the mind, and the body. This division comes out clearly in the *Classic of Purity*, in the teaching that man must get rid of desire to reach union with the One:

> Now the spirit of man loves purity, but his mind disturbs it. The mind of man loves stillness, but his desires draw it away. If he could always send his desires away, his mind would of itself become still. Let his mind be made clean, and his spirit of itself becomes pure . . . . The reason why men are not able to attain to this is because their minds have not been cleansed, and their desires have not been sent away. If one is able to send the desires away, when he then looks in at his mind it is no longer his; when he looks out at his body it is no longer his; and when he looks farther off at external things, they are things which he has nothing to do with (i. 3, 4).

Then, after giving the stages of indrawing to "the condition of perfect stillness," it is asked:

> In that condition of rest independently of place, how can any desire arise? And when no desire any longer arises, there is the true stillness and rest. That true (stillness) becomes (a) constant quality, and responds to external things (without error); yea, that true and constant quality holds possession of the nature. In such constant response and constant stillness there is the constant purity and rest. He who has this absolute purity enters gradually into the (inspiration of) the True Tāo (i. 5).

The supplied words "inspiration of" rather cloud than elucidate the meaning, for entering into the Tāo is congruous with the whole idea and with other scriptures.

On putting away of desire is laid much stress in Tāoism; a commentator on the *Classic of Purity* remarks that understanding the Tāo depends on the absolute purity, and

> The acquiring this Absolute Purity depends entirely on the Putting away of Desire, which is the urgent practical lesson of the Treatise

The *Tāo Teh King says*:

> Always without desire we must be found,
> If its deep mystery we would sound;
> But if desire always within us be,
> Its outer fringe is all that we shall see (i. 3.)

Reincarnation does not seem to be so distinctly taught as might have been expected, although passages are found that imply that the main idea was taken for granted and that the entity was considered as ranging through animal as well as human births. Thus we have from Kwang-ze the quaint and wise story of a dying man, to whom his friend said:

> "Great indeed is the Creator! What will He now make you to become? Where will He take you to? Will He make you the liver of a rat or the arm of an insect?" Sze-lāi replied, "Wherever a parent tells a son to go, east, west, south or north, he simply follows the command .... Here now is a great founder, casting his metal. If the metal were to leap up (in the pot) must be made into a (sword like the) Moysh,' the great founder would be sure to regard it as uncanny. So, again, when a form is being fashioned in the mould of the womb, if it were to say, "I must become a man, I must become a man,' the Creator would be sure to regard it as uncanny. When we once understand that heaven and earth are a great melting-pot, and the Creator a great founder, where can we have to go to, that shall not be right for us? We are born as from a quiet sleep, and we die to a calm awaking." (Bk. vi. Pt. i. Sec. vi).

Turning to the Fifth, the Āryan, race we have the same teachings embodied in the oldest and greatest Āryan religion—the Hindu. The eternal Existence is proclaimed in the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* as "One only, without a second," and it is written:

> It willed, I shall multiply and be born (vi. ii. 1, 3).

The Supreme LOGOS, Brahman, is threefold—Being, Consciousness, Bliss, and it is said:

From This arise life, mind and all the senses, ether, air, fire, water, earth the support of all (*Muṇḍakopaniṣad*, ii. 3).

No grander descriptions of Deity can be found anywhere then in the Hindu Scriptures, but they are becoming so familiar that brief quotation will suffice. Let the following serve as specimens of the wealth of gems:

Manifest, near, moving in the secret place, the great abode, wherein rests all that moves, breathes, and shuts the eyes. Know That as to be worshipped, being and non-being, the best, beyond the knowledge of all creatures. Luminous, subtler than the subtle, in which the worlds and their denizens are infixed. That this imperishable Brahman; That also life and voice and mind . . . in the golden highest sheath is spotless, partless, Brahman; That the pure Light of lights, known by the knowers of the Self . . . That deathless Brahman is before, Brahman behind, Brahman to the right and to the left, below, above, pervading; this Brahman truly is the all. This the best. (*Muṇḍakopaniṣad*, II, ii. 1, 2, 9, 11).

Beyond the universe, Brahman, the supreme, the great, hidden in all beings according to their bodies, the one Breath of the whole universe, the Lord, whom knowing (men) become immortal, I know that mighty Spirit, the shining sun beyond the darkness . . . I know Him the unfading, the ancient, the Soul of all, omnipresent by His nature, whom the Brahman-knowers call unborn, whom they call eternal. (*S'vetās'vataropaniṣad*, iii. 7, 8, 21).

When there is no darkness, no day nor night, no being nor non-being, (there is) S'iva even alone; That the indestructible, That is to be worshipped by Sāvitrī, from That came forth the ancient wisdom. Not above, nor below, nor in the midst, can He be comprehended. Nor is there any similitude for Him whose name is infinite glory. Not with the sight is established His form, none may by the eye behold Him; they who know Him by the heart and by the mind, dwelling in the heart, become immortal. (*ibid.*, iv. 18-20).

That man in his inner Self is one with the Self of the universe—"I am That"—is an idea that so thoroughly pervades all Hindu thought that man is often referred to as the "divine town of Brahman" (*Muṇḍakopaniṣad*, II, ii. 7),

the "town of nine gates" (*S'vetās'vataropaniṣad*, iii. 14), God dwelling in the cavity of the heart (*ibid.*, ii).

> In one manner is to be seen (the Being) which cannot be proved, which is eternal, without spot, higher than the ether, unborn, the great eternal Soul . . . This great unborn Soul is the same which abides as the intelligent (soul) in all living creatures, the same which abides as ether in the heart;[1] in him it sleeps; it is the Subduer of all, the Ruler of all, the sovereign Lord of all; it does not become greater by good works nor less by evil work. It is the Ruler of all, the sovereign Lord of all beings, the Preserver of all beings, the Bridge, the Upholder of the worlds so that they fall not to ruin. (*Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*, IV, iv. 20, 22. Trs. by Dr. E. Röer.)

When God is regarded as the evolver of the universe, the threefold character comes out very clearly as S'iva, Viṣṇu, and Brahmā; or again as Viṣṇu sleeping under the waters, the Lotus springing from Him, and in the Lotus Brahmā. Man is likewise threefold, and in the *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad* the Self is described as conditioned by the body, the subtle body, and the mental body, and then rising out of all into the One "without duality." From the Trimūrti (Trinity) come many Gods, connected with the administration of the universe, as to whom it is said in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* :

> Adore Him, ye Gods, after whom the year by rolling days is completed, the Light of lights, as the immortal Life (IV. iv. 16).

It is hardly necessary to even mention the presence in Hinduism of the teaching of reincarnation, since its whole philosophy of life turns on this pilgrimage of the soul through many births and deaths, and not a book could be taken up in which this truth is not taken for granted. By desires man is bound to this wheel of change, and therefore by knowledge,

[1] "The ether in the heart" is a mystical phrase, used to indicate the One, who dwells therein.

devotion, and the destruction of desires, man must set himself free. When the soul knows God it is liberated (*S'vetās.*, i. 8). The intellect purified by knowledge beholds Him (*Muṇḍ.*, III, i. 8). Knowledge joined to devotion finds the abode of Brahman (*ibid.* III. ii, 4). Whoever knows Brahman becomes Brahman (*ibid.* III. ii. 9). When desires cease the mortal becomes immortal and obtains Brahman (*Kaṭhop.* vi. 14).

Buddhism, as it exists in its northern form, is quite at one with the more ancient faiths, but in the southern form it seems to have let slip the idea of the Logic Trinity as of the One Existence from which They come forth. The LOGOS in His triple manifestation is: The First LOGOS Amitābha, the Boundless Light; the Second, Avalokites'vara or Padmapāṇi (Chenresi); the Third, Mañjus'rī—"the representative of creative wisdom, corresponding to Brahmā" (Eitel's *Sanskrit Chinese Dictionary sub voce*). Chinese Buddhism apparently does not accept the idea of a primordial Existence, beyond the LOGOS, but Nepalese Buddhism postulates Ādi-Buddha, from which Amitābha arises. Padmapāṇi is said by Eitel to be the representative of compassionate Providence and to correspond partly with S'iva, but as the aspect of the Buddhist Trinity that sends forth incarnations. He appears rather to represent the same idea as Viṣṇu, to whom He is further allied by bearing the Lotus (fire and water, or spirit and matter as the primary constituents of the universe). Reincarnation and Karma are so much the fundamentals of Buddhism that it is hardly worth while to insist on them save to note the way of liberation, and to remark that as the Lord Buddha was a Hindu preaching to Hindus, Brahmanical doctrines are taken for granted constantly in His teaching, as matters of course. He was a purifier and a reformer, not an iconoclast, and struck at the

accretions due to ignorance, not at fundamental truths belonging to the Ancient Wisdom :

Those beings who walk in the way of the law that has been well taught, reach the other shore of the great sea of birth and death, that is difficult to cross. (*Udānavarga*, xxix, 37).

Desire binds man, and must be gotten rid of :

It is hard for one who is held by the fetters of desire to free himself of them, says the Blessed One. The steadfast, who care not for the happiness of desires, cast them off and do soon depart (to Nirvāṇa) . . . Mankind has no lasting desires : they are impermanent in them who experience them ; free yourselves then from what cannot last, and abide not in the sojourn of death (*ibid.*, ii. 6, 8).

He who has destroyed desires for (worldly) goods, sinfulness, the bonds of the eye of the flesh, who has torn up desire by the very root, he, I declare, is a Brāhmaṇa. (*ibid.*, xxxiii. 68).

And a Brāhmaṇa is a man " having his last body " (*ibid.*, xxxiii. 41) and is defined as one.

Who, knowing his former abodes (existences), perceives heaven and hell, the Muni who has found the way to put an end to birth (*ibid.*, xxxiii. 55).

In the exoteric Hebrew Scriptures, the idea of a Trinity does not come out strongly, though duality is apparent, and the God spoken of is obviously the LOGOS, not the One Unmanifest :

I am the Lord and there is none else. I form the light and create darkness ; I make peace and create evil ; I am the Lord that doeth all these things (*Is.* xlvii. 7).

Philo, however, has the doctrine of the LOGOS very clearly, and it is found in the Fourth Gospel :

In the beginning was the Word (LOGOS) and the Word was with God and the Word was God . . . All things were made by

Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made (*St. John*, i. 1, 3).

In the Kabalah the doctrine of the One Existence, the Three, the Seven, and then the many, is plainly taught :

> The Ancient of the Ancients, the Unknown of the Unknown, has a form yet also has not any form. It has a form through which the universe is maintained. It also has not any form as It cannot be comprehended. When It first took this form [Kether, the Crown, the First LOGOS], It permitted to proceed from It nine brilliant Lights [Wisdom and the Voice, forming the Triad, and then the seven lower Sephiroth] . . . It is the Ancient of the Ancients, the Mystery of the Mysteries, the Unknown of the Unknown. It has a form which appertains to It, since It appears (through it) to us, as the Ancient Man above all, as the Ancient of the Ancients, and as that which there is the Most Unknown among the Unknown. But under that form by which It makes Itself known, It however still remains the Unknown. (Isaac Myer's *Qabballah*, from the *Zohar*, pp. 274, 275).

Myer points out that the "form" is "not 'the Ancient of ALL the Ancients' who is the Ain Soph."

Again :

> Three Lights are in the Holy Upper which unite as One; and they are the basis of the Thorah, and this opens the door to all . . . Come see! the mystery of the word. These are three degrees and each exists by itself, and yet all are One and are knotted in One, nor are they separated one from another . . . Three come out from One, One exists in Three, it is the force between Two, Two nourish One, One nourishes many sides, thus All is One. (*ibid.*, pp. 373, 375, 376).

Needless to say that the Hebrews held the doctrine of many Gods—"Who is like unto Thee, O Lord, among the Gods?" (*Ex.* xv, ii)—and of multitudes of subordinate ministrants, the "Sons of God," the "Angels of the Lord," the "Ten Angelic Hosts."

Of the commencement of the Universe the *Zohar* teaches :

> In the beginning was the Will of the King, prior to any existence which came into being, through emanation from this

Will. It sketched and engraved the forms of all things that were to be manifested from concealment into view, in the supreme and dazzling light of the Quadrant [the sacred Tetractys] (Myer's *Qabbalah*, pp. 194, 195).

Nothing can exist in which the Deity is not immanent, and with regard to Reincarnation it is taught that the Soul is present in the divine Idea ere coming to earth; if the Soul remained quite pure during its trial it escaped rebirth, but this seems to have been only a theoretical possibility, as it is said:

> All souls are subject to revolution (metempsychosis, a'leen b'gilgoolah) but men do not know the ways of the Holy One; blessed be It! they are ignorant of the way they have been judged in all time, and before they came into this world and when they have quitted it (*ibid.*, p. 198).

Traces of this belief occur both in the Hebrew and Christian exoteric scriptures, as in the belief that Elijah would return, and later that he had returned in John the Baptist.

Turning to glance at Egypt we find there from hoariest antiquity its famous Trinity, Ra, Osiris-Isis as the dual Second LOGOS, and Horus. The great hymn to Amun-Ra will be remembered:

> The Gods bow before Thy Majesty by exalting the Souls of That which produceth them . . . and say to Thee: Peace to all emanations from the unconscious Father of the conscious Fathers of the Gods . . . Thou Producer of beings, we adore the Souls which emanate from Thee. Thou begettest us, O Thou Unknown, and we greet Thee in worshipping each God-Soul which descendeth from Thee and liveth in us (quoted in *Secret Doctrine*, iii, p. 486).

The "conscious Fathers of the Gods" are the LOGOI, the "unconscious Father" is the One Existence, unconscious not as being less but as being infinitely more than what we call consciousness, a limited thing.

In the fragments of the *Book of the Dead* we can study the conceptions of the reincarnating of the human soul, of its pilgrimage towards and its ultimate union with the LOGOS. The famous papyrus of "the scribe Ani, triumphant in peace," is full of touches that remind the reader of the scriptures of other faiths; his journey through the underworld, his expectation of re-entering his body (the form taken by reincarnation among the Egyptians), his identification with the LOGOS:

> Saith Osiris Ani: I am the great One, son of the great One; I am Fire, the son of Fire . . . I have knit together my bones, I have made myself whole and sound; I have become young once more; I am Osiris, the Lord of eternity (xliii. 1, 4).

In Pierret's recension of the *Book of the Dead* we find the striking passage:

> I am the being of mysterious names who prepares for himself dwellings for millions of years (p. 22). Heart, that comest to me from my mother, my heart necessary to my existence on earth . . . Heart, that comest to me from my mother, heart that is necessary to me for my transformation. (pp. 113, 114).

In *Zoroastrianism* we find the conception of the One Existence imaged as Boundless Space, whence arises the LOGOS, the creator Aūharmazd,

> Supreme in omniscience and goodness, and unrivalled in splendour; the region of light is the place of Aūharmazd (*The Bundahis*, *Sacred Books of the East*, v. pp. 3, 4).

To Him in the *Yasna*, the chief liturgy of the Zarathustrians, homage is first paid:

> I announce and I (will) complete (my Yasna [worship]) to Ahura Mazda, the Creator, the radiant and glorious, the greatest and the best, the most beautiful (?) (to our conceptions), the most firm, the wisest, and the one of all whose body is the most perfect, who attains his ends the most infallibly, because of His righteous order, to Him who disposes our minds aright, who sends His

joy-creating grace afar; who made us and has fashioned us, and who has nourished and protected us, who is the most bounteous Spirit (*Sacred Books of the East*, xxxi, pp. 195, 196).

The worshipper then pays homage to the Ameshaspends and other Gods, but the supreme manifested God, the LOGOS, is not here presented as triune. As with the Hebrews, there was a tendency in the exoteric faith to lose sight of this fundamental truth. Fortunately we can trace the primitive teaching, though it disappeared in later times from the popular belief. Dr. Haug, in his *Essays on the Parsis* (translated by Dr. West and forming vol. v. of Trübner's Oriental Series) states that Ahuramazda—Aūharmazd or Hōrmazd—is the Supreme Being, and that from Him were produced

Two primeval causes, which, though different, were united and produced the world of material things as well as that of the spirit (p. 303).

These were called twins and are everywhere present in Ahuramazda as well as in man. One produces reality, the other non-reality, and it is these who in later Zoroastrianism became the opposing Spirits of good and evil. In the earlier teachings they evidently formed the Second LOGOS, duality being His characteristic mark.

The "good" and "bad" are merely light and darkness, spirit and matter, the fundamental "twins" of the Universe, the Two from the One,

Criticizing the later idea Dr. Haug says:

Such is the original Zoroastrian notion of the two creative Spirits, who form only two parts of the Divine Being. But in the course of time, this doctrine of the great founder was changed and corrupted, in consequence of misunderstandings and false interpretations. Spentōmainyush [the "good spirit"] was taken as a name of Ahuramazda Himself, and then of course Angrōmainyush [the "evil spirit"], by becoming entirely separated from

Ahuramazda, was regarded as the constant adversary of Ahuramazda; thus the Dualism of God and Devil arose (p. 305).

Dr. Haug's view seems to be supported by the *Gātha Ahunavaiti*, given with the other Gāthas by "the archangels" to Zoroaster, or Zarathustra:

> In the beginning there was a pair of twins, two spirits, each of a peculiar activity; these are the good and the base . . . And these two spirits united created the first (the material things); one the reality, the other the non-reality. . . . And to succour this life (to increase it) Armaiti came with wealth, the good and true mind; she, the everlasting one, created the material world. . . All perfect things are garnered up in the splendid residence of the Good Mind, the Wise and the Righteous, who are known as the best beings (*Yas.* xxx. 3, 4, 7, 10; Dr. Haug's Trans. pp. 149-151).

Here the three LOGOI are seen: Ahuramazda the first, the supreme Life; in and from Him the "twins," the Second Logos; then Armaiti, the Mind, the Creator of the universe, the Third LOGOS. Later Mitra appears, and in the exoteric faith clouds the primitive truth to some extent; of him it is said:

> Whom Ahura Mazda has established to maintain and look over all this moving world, and who maintains and looks over all this moving world; who, never sleeping, wakefully guards the creation of Mazda (*Mihir Yast.*, xxvi, 103; *Sacred Books of the East*, xxiii).

He was a subordinate God, the Light of Heaven, as Varuṇa was the Heaven itself, one of the great ruling Intelligences. The highest of these ruling Intelligences were the six Ameshaspends, headed by the Good Thought of Ahuramazda, Vohūman, "who have charge of the whole material creation" (*Sacred Books of the East*, v. p. 10, note). Reincarnation does not seem to be taught in the books which, so far, have been translated, and the belief is not current

among modern Parsis. But we do find the idea of the Spirit in man as a spark that is to become a flame and to be reunited to the Supreme Fire, and this must imply a development for which rebirth is a necessity. Nor will Zoroastrianism ever be understood until we recover the *Chaldæan Oracles* and allied writings, for there is its real root.

Travelling westwards to Greece, we meet with the Orphic system, described with such abundant learning by Mr. G.R.S. Mead in his work *Orpheus*. The Ineffable Thrice-unknown Darkness was the name given to the One Existence:

> According to the theology of Orpheus, all things originate from an immense principle, to which through the imbecility and poverty of human conception, we give a name, though it is perfectly ineffable, and in the reverential language of the Egyptians is a *thrice unknown darkness* in contemplation of which all knowledge is refunded into ignorance. (Thomas Taylor, quoted in *Orpheus*, p. 93).

From this the "Primordial Triad," Universal Good, Universal Soul, Universal Mind, again the Logic Trinity. Of this Mr. Mead writes:

> The first Triad, which is manifestable to intellect, is but a reflection of, or substitute for, the Unmanifestable, and its hypostases are: (*a*) the Good, which is super-essential; (*b*) Soul (the World-Soul), which is a self-motive essence; and (*c*) Intellect (or the Mind), which is an impartible, immovable essence (*Ibid*., p. 94).

After this, a series of ever-descending triads, showing the characteristics of the first in diminishing splendour, until man is reached who

> Has in him potentially the sum and substance of the universe. . . "The race of men and gods is one" (Pindar, who was a Pythagorean, quoted by Clemens, *Strom*, v. 709) . . . . Thus man was called the microcosm or little world, to distinguish him from the universe or great world. (*Ibid*., p. 271).

He has the Nous, or real mind, the Logos or rational part, the Alogos or irrational part, the two latter again forming each a triad, and thus presenting the more elaborate septenary division. The man was also regarded as having three vehicles, the physical and subtle bodies and the luciform body or augoeides, that

> Is the "causal body," or karmic vesture of the soul, in which its destiny or rather all the seeds of past causation are stored. This is the "thread-soul" as it is sometimes called, the "body" that passes over from one incarnation to another. (*Ibid.*, p. 284).

As to reincarnation

> Together with all the adherents of the Mysteries in every land the Orphics believed in reincarnation (*Ibid.*, p. 292).

To this Mr. Mead brings abundant testimony, and he shows that it was taught by Plato, Empedocles, Pythagoras, and others. Only by virtue could men escape from the life-wheel.

Taylor, in his notes to the *Select Works of Plotinus*, quotes from Damascius, as to the teachings of Plato on the One beyond the One, the unmanifest Existence:

> Perhaps, indeed, Plato leads us ineffably through *the one* as a medium to the ineffable beyond *the one* which is now the subject of discussion: and this by an oblation of *the one* in the same manner as he leads to *the one* by an oblation of other things . . . That which is beyond *the one* is to be honoured in the most perfect silence . . . *The one* indeed wills to be by itself, but with no other: but the unknown beyond *the one* is perfectly ineffable, which we acknowledge we neither know, nor are ignorant of, but which has about itself super-ignorance. Hence by proximity to this, *the one* itself is darkened; for being near to the immense principle, if it be lawful so to speak, it remains as it were in the adytum of that truly mystic silence . . . The first is above *the one* and *all things*, being more simple than either of these (pp. 341-343).

The Pythagorean, Platonic, and Neo-Platonic schools have so many points of contact with Hindu and Buddhist

thought that their issue from one fountain is obvious. R. Garbe in his work, *Die Sāmkhya Philosphie* (iii. pp. 85 to 105), presents many of these points, and his statement may be summarized as follows:

The most striking is the resemblance—or more correctly the identity—of the doctrine of the One and Only in the Upaniṣads and the Eleatic school. Xenophanes' teaching of the unity of God and the Kosmos and of the changelessness of the One, and even more that of Parmenides, who held that reality is ascribable only to the One unborn, indestructible, and omnipresent, while all that is manifold and subject to change is but an appearance. and further that Being and Thinking are the same—these doctrines are completely identical with the essential contents of the Upaniṣads and of the Vedāntic philosophy which springs from them. But even earlier still the view of Thales, that all that is has sprung from water, is curiously like the Vedic doctrine that the Universe arose from the bosom of the waters. Later on Aneximander assumed as the basis (ἀρχή *arche*) of all things an eternal, infinite and indefinite substance, from which all definite substances proceed and into which they return—an assumption identical with that which lies at the root of the Sāṅkhya, *viz.*, the Prakṛti from which the whole material side of the universe evolved. And his famous saying πάντα ῥεῖ [1] expresses the characteristic view of the Sāṅkhya that all things are ever changing under the ceaseless activity of the three guṇas. Empedocles again taught theories of transmigration and evolution practically the same as those of Sāṅkhyas, while his theory that nothing can come into being which does not already exist is even more closely identical with a characteristically Sāṅkhyan doctrine.

[1] Panta rhei or "all things flow."

Both Anaxagoras and Democritus also present several points of close agreement, especially the latter's view as to the nature and position of the Gods, and the same applies, notably in some curious matters of detail to Epicurus. But it is, however, in the teachings of Pythagoras that we find the closest and most frequent identities of teaching and argumentation, explained as due to Pythagoras himself having visited India and learnt his philosophy there, as tradition asserts. In later centuries we find some peculiarly Sāṅkhyan and Buddhist ideas playing a prominent part in Gnostic thought. The following quotation from Lassen, cited by Garbe on p. 97, shows this very clearly :—

"Buddhism in general distinguishes clearly between Spirit and Light, and does not regard the latter as immaterial; but a view of Light is found among them which is closely related to that of the Gnostics. According to this, Light is the vehicle of the manifestations of spirit in matter; the intelligence thus clothed in Light comes into relation with matter, in which the light can be lessened and at last quite obscured, in which case the intelligence falls finally into complete unconsciousness. Of the highest intelligence it is maintained that it is neither Light nor Not-Light, neither Darkness nor Not-Darkness, since all these expressions denote relations of the intelligence to the Light, which indeed in the beginning was free from these connections, but later on encloses the intelligence and mediates its connection with matter. It follows from this that the Buddhist view ascribes to the highest intelligence the power to produce light from itself, and that in this respect also there is an agreement between Buddhism and Gnosticism."

Garbe here points out that as regards the points alluded to, the agreement, between Gnosticism and the Sāṅkhya is very much closer than that with Buddhism ; for while these views as to the relations between Light and Spirit pertain to the later phases of Buddhism, and are not at all fundamental to, or characteristic of it as such, the Sāṅkhya teaches clearly and precisely that Spirit *is* Light. Later still the influence

of the Sāṅkhya thought is very plainly evident in the Neo-Platonic writers; while the doctrine of the LOGOS or Word, though not of Sāṅkhyan origin, shows even in its details that it has been derived from India, where the conception of Vāch, the Divine Word, plays so prominent a part in the Brāhmanical system.

Coming to the Christian religion, contemporaneous with the Gnostic and Neo-Platonic systems, we shall find no difficulty in tracing most of the same fundamental teachings with which we have now become so familiar. The threefold LOGOS appears as the Trinity, the First LOGOS, the fount of all life, being the Father; the dual-natured Second LOGOS the Son, God-man; the Third, the creative Mind, the Holy Ghost, whose brooding over the waters of chaos brought forth the worlds. Then come "the seven Spirits of God" (*Rev.* iv. 5), and the hosts of archangels and angels. Of the One Existence from which all comes and into which all returns, but little is hinted, the nature that "is past finding out"; but the great doctors of the Church Catholic always posit the unfathomable Deity, incomprehensible, infinite, and therefore necessarily but One and partless. Man is made in the "image of God" (*Gen.*, i. 26, 27), and is consequently triple in his nature—Spirit and Soul and body (1. *Thess.* v. 23); he is a "habitation of God" (*Eph.* ii. 22) the "temple of God" (1. *Cor.*, iii. 16), the "temple of the Holy Ghost" (1 *Cor.* vi. 19)—phrases that exactly echo the Hindu teaching. The doctrine of reincarnation is rather taken for granted in the *New Testament* than distinctly taught; thus Jesus speaking of John the Baptist declares that he is Elias "which was for to come" (*Matt.* xi. 14), referring to the words of Malachi, "I will send you Elijah the prophet"—(*Mal*, iv. 5); and again, when asked as to Elijah coming before the Messiah,

he answered that "Elias is come already and they knew him not" (*Matt.*, xvii. 12). So again we find the disciples taking reincarnation for granted in asking whether blindness from birth was a punishment for a man's sin, and Jesus in answer not rejecting the possibility of ante-natal sin, but only excluding it as causing the blindness in the special instance (*John* ix. 1-3). The remarkable phrase applied to "him that overcometh" in *Rev.*, iii. 12, that he shall be "a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out," has been taken as signifying escape from rebirth. From the writings of some of the Christian Fathers a good case may be made out for a current belief in reincarnation; some argue that only the pre-existence of the soul is taught, but this view does not seem to me supported by the evidence.

The unity of moral teaching is not less striking than the unity of the conceptions of the universe and of the experiences of those who rose out of the prison of the body into the freedom of the higher spheres. It is clear that this body of primeval teaching was in the hands of definite custodians, who had schools in which they taught disciples who studied their doctrines. The identity of these schools and of their discipline stands out plainly when we study the moral teaching, the demands made on the pupils, and the mental and spiritual states to which they were raised. A caustic division is made in the *Tāo Teh King* of the types of scholars:

> Scholars of the highest class, when they hear about the Tāo, earnestly carry it into practice. Scholars of the middle class, when they have heard about it, seem now to keep it and now to lose it. Scholars of the lowest class, when they have heard about it, laugh greatly at it (*Sacred Books of the East*, xxxix, *op. cit.* xli. 1.).

In the same book we read:

> 'The sage puts his own person last, and yet it is found in the foremost place; he treats his person as if it were foreign to him,

and yet that person is preserved. Is it not because he has no personal and private ends, that therefore such ends are realised? (vii. 2). He is free from self-display, and therefore he shines; from self-assertion, and therefore he is distinguished; from self-boasting, and therefore his merit is acknowledged; from self-complacency, and therefore he acquires superiority. It is because he is thus free from striving that therefore no one in the world is able to strive with him. (xxii. 2). There is no guilt greater than to sanction ambition; no calamity greater than to be discontented with one's lot; no fault greater than the wish to be getting (xlvi. 2). To those who are good (to me) I am good; and to those who are not good (to me) I am also good; and thus (all) get to be good. To those who are sincere (with me) I am sincere; and to those who are not sincere (with me) I am also sincere; and thus (all) get to be sincere (xlix. 1). He who has in himself abundantly the attributes (of the Tāo) is like an infant. Poisonous insects will not sting him; fierce beasts will not seize him; birds of prey will not strike him (lv. 1). I have three precious things which I prize and hold fast. The first is gentleness; the second is economy; the third is shrinking from taking precedence of others . . . . Gentleness is sure to be victorious, even in battle, and firmly to maintain its ground. Heaven will save its possessor, by his (very) gentleness protecting him (lxvii. 2, 4).

Among the Hindus there were selected scholars deemed worthy of special instruction to whom the Guru imparted the secret teachings, while the general rules of right living may be gathered from Manu's *Ordinances*, the *Upaniṣads*, the *Mahābhārata*, and many other treatises:

Let him say what is true, let him say what is pleasing, let him utter no disagreeable truth, and let him utter no agreeable falsehood; that is the eternal law. (Manu, iv. 138). Giving no pain to any creature, let him slowly accumulate spiritual merit (iv. 238). For that twice-born man, by whom not the smallest danger even is caused to created beings, there will be no danger from any (quarter) after he is freed from his body (vi. 40). Let him patiently bear hard words, let him not insult anybody, and let him not become anybody's enemy for the sake of this (perishable) body. Against an angry man let him not in return show anger, let him bless when he is cursed (vi. 47, 48). Freed from passion, fear, and anger, thinking on Me, taking refuge in Me, purified in the fire of wisdom, many have entered into My Being. (*Bhagavad-Gītā*, iv.

10). Supreme joy is for this Yogi whose Manas is peaceful, whose passion-nature is calmed, who is sinless and of the nature of Brahman (vi. 27). He who beareth no ill-will to any being, friendly and compassionate, without attachment and egoism, balanced in pleasure and pain, and forgiving, ever content, harmonious, with the self-controlled, resolute, with Manas and Buddhi dedicated to Me, he, My devotee, is dear to Me. (xii. 13, 14).

If we turn to the Buddha, we find him with his Arhats, to whom his secret teachings were given ; while published we have :

The wise man through earnestness, virtue and purity makes himself an island which no flood can submerge (*Udānavarga*, iv. 5). The wise man in this world holds fast to faith and wisdom : these are his greatest treasures ; he casts aside all other riches (x. 9). He who bears ill-will to those who bear ill-will can never become pure ; but he who feels no ill-will pacifies those who hate ; as hatred brings misery to mankind, the sage knows no hatred (xiii. 12). Overcome anger by not being angered ; overcome evil by good ; overcome avarice by liberality ; overcome falsehood by truth (xx. 18).

The Zoroastrian is taught to praise Ahuramazda, and then :

What is fairest, what pure, what immortal, what brilliant, all that is good. The good spirit we honour, the good kingdom we honour, and the good law, and the good wisdom (*Yasna*, xxxvii). May there come now to this dwelling contentment, blessing, guilelessness, and wisdom of the pure. (*Yasna* lix.). Purity is the best good. Happiness, happiness is to him ; namely, to the best pure in purity (*Ashem-vohu*). All good thoughts, words, and works are done with knowledge. All evil thoughts, words, and works are not done with knowledge (*Mispa Kumata*). (Selected from the *Avesta* in *Ancient Iranian and Zoroastrian Morals* by Dhunjibhoy Jamsetji Medhora).

The Hebrew had his "schools of the prophets" and his Kabbalah, and in the exoteric books we find the accepted moral teachings :

Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord and who stand in His holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart ; who

hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully (*Ps.* xxiv. 3, 4). What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God? (*Micah*, vi. 8). The lip of truth shall be established for ever; but a lying tongue is but for a moment (*Prov.* xii. 19). Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked that thou cover him, and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh? (*Is.* lviii. 6, 7).

The Christian Teacher had his secret instruction for his disciples (*Matt.* xiii. 10-17) and he bade them:

Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine (*Matt.*, vii. 6).

For public teaching we may refer to the beatitudes in the Sermon on the Mount, and to such doctrines as:

I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you . . . Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect (*Matt.* v. 44, 48). He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it. (x. 39). Whosoever shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven (xviii. 4). The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance; against such there is no law. (*Gal.* v. 22, 23). Let us love one another; for love is of God; and everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God (1. *John.* iv. 7).

The school of Pythagoras and those of the Neo-Platonists kept up the tradition for Greece, and we know that Pythagoras gained some of his learning in India, while Plato studied and was initiated in the schools of Egypt. More precise information has been published of the Grecian schools than of others; the Pythagorean had pledged disciples as well as an outer discipline, the inner circle passing through three degrees

during five years of probation. (For details see G.R.S. Mead's *Orpheus*, pp. 263 *et seq.*). The outer discipline he describes as follows:

"We must first give ourselves up entirely to God. When a man prays he should never ask for any particular benefit, fully convinced that that will be given which is right and proper, and according to the wisdom of God and not the subject of our own selfish desires. (Diod. Sic. ix. 41). By virtue alone does man arrive at blessedness, and this is the exclusive privilege of a rational being (Hippodamus, *De Felicitate*, ii. Orelli. *Opusc. Graecor*, *Sent. et Moral.* ii. 284). In himself, of his own nature, man is neither good nor happy, but he may become so by the teaching of the true doctrine μαθήσεως προνοίας ποτιδέεται Hippo, *ibid.*)[1] The most sacred duty is filial pity. "God showers his blessings on him who honours and reveres the author of his days"—says Pampelus (*De Parentibus*, Orelli, *op. cit.* ii. 345). Ingratitude towards one's parents is the blackest of all crimes, writes Perictione (*ibid.* p. 350) who is supposed to have been the mother of Plato. The cleanliness and delicacy of all Pythagorean writings were remarkable (Ælian, *Hist. Var.* xiv, 19). In all that concerns chastity and marriage their principles are of the utmost purity. Everywhere the great teacher recommends chastity and temperance; but at the same time he directs that the married should first become parents before living a life of absolute celibacy, in order that children might be born under favourable conditions for continuing the holy life and succession of the Sacred Science (Jamblichus, *Vit. Pythag.*, and Hierocal. ap. Sto 6. *Serm.* xlv. 14). This is exceedingly interesting, for it is precisely the same regulation that is laid down in the *Mānava Dharma S'āstra*, the great Indian Code . . . Adultery was most sternly condemned (Jamb. *ibid.*). Moreover the most gentle treatment of the wife by the husband was enjoined, for had he not taken her as his companion "before the Gods"? (See Lascaulx, *Zur Geschicte der Ehe bei den Griechen* in the *Mem. de l'Acad. de Baviere*, vii. 107, *sq.*).

Marriage was not an animal union, but a spiritual tie. Therefore, in her turn, the wife should love her husband even more than herself, and in all things be devoted and obedient. It is further interesting to remark that the finest characters among women with which ancient Greece presents us were formed in the school of

[1] (*Mathēsēos Kai Pronoias potideetai*) "He beholds discipline and prudence."

Pythagoras, and the same is true of the men.' The authors of antiquity are agreed that this discipline had succeeded in producing the highest examples not only of the purest chastity and sentiment, but also a simplicity of manners, a delicacy, and a taste for serious pursuits which was unparalleled. This is admitted even by Christian writers (see Justin, xx. 4) . . . Among the members of the school the idea of justice directed all their acts, while they observed the strictest tolerance and compassion in their mutual relationships. For justice is the principle of all virtue, as Polus (ap. Stob. *Serm*, vii. ed. Schow. p. 232) teaches; 'tis justice which maintains peace and balance in the soul; she is the mother of good order in all communities, makes concord between husband and wife, love between master and servant.

The word of a Pythagorean was also his bond. And finally a man should live so as to be ever ready for death. (Hippolytus, *Philos*, vi) (*Ibid.* pp. 263-267).

The treatment of the virtues in the neo-Platonic schools is interesting, and the distinction is clearly made between morality and spiritual development, or as Plotinus put it, "The endeavour is not to be without sin, but to be a God" (*Select Works of Plotinus*, trans. by Thomas Taylor, ed. 1895, p. 11). The lowest stage was the becoming without sin by acquiring the "political virtues" which made a man perfect in conduct (the physical and ethical being below these), the reason controlling and adorning the irrational nature. Above these were the cathartic, pertaining to reason alone, and which liberated the Soul from the bonds of generation; the theoretic or intellectual, lifting the Soul into touch with natures superior to itself; and the paradigmatic, giving it a knowledge of true being.

Hence he who energizes according to the practical virtues is *a worthy man*; but he who energizes according to the cathartic virtues is *a demoniacal man*, or is also *a good demon*.[1] He who energizes according to the intellectual virtues alone is *a God*. But he who energizes according to the paradigmatic virtues is *the*

[1] A good spiritual intelligence, as the daimon of Socrates.

Father of the Gods (*Ibid.* note on Intellectual Prudence, pp. 325-332).

By various practices the disciples were taught to escape from the body, and to rise into higher regions. As grass is drawn from a sheath, the inner man was to draw himself from his bodily casing (*Kaṭhopaniṣad*, vi. 17). The " body of light " or " radiant body " of the Hindus is the " luciform body " of the neo-Platonists, and in this the man rises to find the Self.

> Not grasped by the eye, nor by speech, nor by the other senses (*lit.* Gods), nor by austerity, nor by religious rites ; by serene wisdom, by the pure essence only doth one see the partless One in meditation. This subtle Self is to be known by the mind in which the fivefold life is sleeping. The mind of all creatures is instinct with (these) lives : in this, purified, manifests the Self (*Muṇḍakopaniṣad*, III, ii. 8. 9).

Then alone can man enter the region where separation is not, where " the spheres have ceased." In G.R.S. Mead's Introduction to Taylor's *Plotinus* he quotes from Plotinus a description of a sphere which is evidently the Turīya of the Hindus :

> They likewise see all things, not those with which generation, but those with which essence is present. And they perceive themselves in others. For all things there are diaphanous ; and nothing is dark and resisting, but everything is apparent to everyone internally and throughout. For light everywhere meets with light ; since everything contains all things in itself and again sees all things in another. So that all things are everywhere and all is all. Each thing likewise is everything. And the splendour there is infinite. For everything there is great, since even that which is small is great. The sun too which is there is all the stars ; and again each star is the sun and all the stars. In each, however, a different property predominates, but at the same time all things are visible in each. Motion likewise there is pure ; for the motion is not confounded by a mover different from it. (p. lxxiii).

A description which is a failure, because the region is one above describing by mortal language, but a description

that could only have been given by one whose eyes had been opened.

A whole volume might easily be written on the similarities between the religions of the world, but the above imperfect statement must suffice as a preface to the study of Theosophy, to that which is a fresh and fuller presentment to the world of the ancient truths on which it has ever been fed. All these similarities point to a single source, and that is the Brotherhood of the White Lodge, the Hierarchy of Adepts who watch over and guide the evolution of humanity, and who have preserved these truths unimpaired, from time to time, as necessity arose, reasserting them in the ears of men. From other worlds, from earlier humanities, they came to help our globe, evolved by a process comparable to that now going on with ourselves, and that will be more intelligible when we have completed our present study than it may now appear;[1] and they have afforded this help, reinforced by the flower of our own humanity, from the earliest times until today. Still they teach eager pupils, showing the path and guiding the disciple's steps; still they may be reached by all who seek them, bearing in their hands the sacrificial fuel of love, of devotion, of unselfish longing to know in order to serve; still they carry out the ancient discipline, still unveil the ancient mysteries. The two pillars of their Lodge gateway are Love and Wisdom, and through its strait portal can only pass those from whose shoulders has fallen the burden of desire and selfishness.

A heavy task lies before us, and beginning on the physical plane we shall climb slowly upwards; but a bird's eye view of the great sweep of evolution and of its purpose may help us, ere

[1] This paper is the introduction to an exposition of Theosophy on which the author is engaged.

we begin our detailed study in the world that surrounds us. A LOGOS, ere a system has begun to be, has in His mind the whole, existing as idea—all forces, all forms, all that in due process shall emerge into objective life. He draws the circle of manifestation within which He wills to energize, and circumscribes Himself to be the life of His universe. As we watch, we see strata appearing of successive densities, till seven vast regions are apparent, and in these centres of energy appear whirlpools of matter that separate from each other, until when the processes of separation and of condensation are over—so far as we are here concerned—we see a central sun, the physical symbol of the LOGOS, and seven great planetary chains, each chain consisting of seven globes. Narrowing down our view to the chain of which our globe is one we see life-waves sweep round it, forming the kingdoms of nature, the three elemental, the mineral, vegetable, animal, human. Narrowing down our view still further to our own globe and its surroundings we watch human evolution, and see man developing self-consciousness by a series of many life-periods; then entering on a single man we trace his growth and see that each life-period has a three-fold division, that each is linked to all life-periods behind it reaping their results, and to all life-periods before it, sowing their harvests, by a law that cannot be broken; that thus man may climb upwards, with each life-period adding to his experience, each life-period lifting him higher in purity, in devotion, in intellect, in power of usefulness, until at last he stands where they stand who are now the Teachers, fit to pay to his younger brothers the debt he owes to them.

S'ṚṄGĀRA-KALLOLA, A LOVE-POEM BY RĀYA-BHAṬṬA AND ITS RARE MANUSCRIPT DATED A.D. 1602

By P. K. Gode

Aufrecht records only one MS. of a work called *S'ṛṅgāra-Kallola* (=**SK.**) by Rāyabhaṭṭa *viz. CC. III, 137*—" Peters. 6, p. 28."

This MS. is identical with MS. *No. 362 of 1895-98* in the Govt. MSS. Library at the B.O.R. Institute, Poona. It consists of 11 folios (10 lines to a page, 36 letters to a line). The MS. is written in Devanāgarī characters on country paper, which is old in appearance but well preserved. It begins[1]:—

" ॐ ॥ श्रीगणाधिपतये नमः ॥

अनुनयति गिरीशे द्राक्यपावर्त्तितांग्या:

स्फटिकभवनभित्तौ तन्मुखेंदुं समीक्ष्य ।

[1] In the top-margin before the beginning of the text we find the following verse recorded in a slightly different hand-writing from that of the MS :—

" अधरे नववीटिकानुरागो नयने कज्जलमुज्वलं दुकूलं ।

कुसुमाभरणं नितंबिनीनामितरं भूषणमङ्गदूषणानि ॥ १ ॥

This verse is identical with verse 29 on p. 263 of सुभाषितरत्नभाण्डागार, N. S. Press, Bombay, 1911. Evidently it has nothing to do with the text of the शृंगारकल्लोल,

पुनरभिवलिताया विस्मयस्मेरमुख्या
जयति गिरिसुतायाः कोपि दृष्टिप्रसादः ॥ १ ॥

आनम्राः प्रथमं कृतागस इव व्यापारशून्यास्तथा
संरुद्धा कीलिता इव विनिर्याताः स्खलत्यग्रतः ।
कामारेर्भयभंगुरा इव मुखं स्मेरं स्पृशंत्यः शनैः
पार्वत्या स्मरबंधवो नव परीहासे दृशः पांतु वः ॥ २ ॥

The MS. ends:—

"अहं सासैवाहं तदिदमिति लोकव्यवहृतिं
न जाने प्रेमाणं परमिह ततो नापि विरहम् ।
रहस्यं नो जानान्निखिलमिदमानंगनिगमं
मुधै वार्द्धैरंगैः समसृजत देव्याः पशुपतिः ॥ १०३ ॥

गुंफो वाचामसृणमधुरो मालतीनामिव स्या-
दर्थो वाच्यः प्रसरणपरः सम्मितः सौरभस्य ।
भाववंशा गोरस इव सस्तद्विवाह्लादहेतु-
माले वासौ सुकविरचना कस्य भूषां न धत्ते ॥ १०४ ॥

इति श्री **महाकवि** पंडित श्रीमद्रा**यभट्टकृतं** **श्रृंगारकल्लोलं** नाम काव्यं संपूर्णं ॥ छ ॥ ॥ छ ॥ ॥ छ ॥ संवत १६५८ वर्षे श्रावणशुदि ९ भौमे लिखितं **मुकुंदेन** ॥ श्रीः ॥ छ ॥

It is clear from the above Colophon that the MS. was copied by one Mukunda in *Saṁvat 1658*=**A.D. 1602.** This date of the MS. of the **SK.** of Rāyabhaṭṭa enables us to conclude that Rāyabhaṭṭa flourished definitely before *A.D. 1602* or even before A.D. 1550,

I have not come across any quotations from the **SK**, except the two verses mentioned as Rāyabhaṭṭa's (रायभट्टस्य) in the anthology *Padyaveṇī* of Veṇīdatta, who composed his *Pañcatattva-prakāśikā* in *A.D. 1644.*[1] These two verses are Nos. *311* and *351* in the critical edition of the *Padyaveṇī* by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. They read as follows :—

Page 91—

"३११. एकाङ्घ्रिं विनिधाय कान्तचरणे तज्जानुदेशे परं
लीलोदञ्चितमध्यमा करयुगेणाऽऽबध्य तत्कन्धराम् ।
वक्षस्तस्य घनोन्नत-स्तनयुगेनाऽऽपीड्य गाढं रसा-
दास्यं धन्यतमस्य पूर्णपुलका चन्द्रानना चुम्बति ॥ २ ॥
रायभट्टस्य"

Page 102—

"३५१. प्रस्थाने शकुनानि सन्तु सततं भद्रं तवोज्जृम्भता-
मादायेप्सितमाशु तातचरणाम्भोजं समालोकयः ।
याचेऽहं विधिमत्र हन्त जविनामग्रेसराणां मम
प्राणानां प्रिय मास्म भूः पथि भवद्विश्लेष-लक्ष्मागमः ॥ १ ॥
रायभट्टस्य"

Dr. Chaudhuri states (p. 113 of Intro. to *Padyaveṇī*) that these two verses "appear to have been culled from this work *viz.* the **SK.** of Rāyabhaṭṭa, a MS. of which has been noticed by Peterson in his *Sixth Report.* This MS. is identical with MS. *No. 362 of 1895-98* described by me in this paper. I have verified Dr. Chaudhuri's surmise and found it correct. The text of the two verses reads as follows in the MS. of the **SK.** dated A.D. 1602 before me :—

[1] *Vide* p. 79 of *Padyaveṇī* (Introduction) ed. by J.B. Chaudhuri, Calcutta, 1944.

folio 3—verse 15

"एकांघ्रिं विनिधाय कांतचरणे तज्जानुदेशे परं
लीलोदंचितमध्यमाकरयुगे नावर्ज्य तत्कंधरां ।
वक्षस्तस्य घनोन्नतस्तनभरेणापीड्य गाढं रसा-
दास्यं धन्यतमस्य पूर्णपुलका चंद्रानना चुंबति ॥ १५ ॥

folio 4—verse 27

"प्रस्थाने शकुनानि संतु सततं भद्रं तवोऽज्जुंभता-
मादायेप्सितमाशु तातचरणांभोजं समालोकयेः ।
याचेऽहं विधिमत्र हंत जविनामग्रेसराणां मम
प्राणानां प्रिय मा स्मभूत्पथि भवद्विश्लेषलक्ष्मागमः ॥ २७ ॥

The identity of the two verses quoted as रायभट्टस्य by Veṇīdatta with those numbered 15 and 27 in the **SK.** of Rāyabhaṭṭa[1] has now been clearly established. As Rāyabhaṭṭa (flourished long before *A.D. 1602*, the date of the MS. of his **SK**, it is natural that he should be quoted by a subsequent anthologist who flourished about *A.D. 1644*. In the colophon of the MS. of the **SK.** before us Rāyabhaṭṭa is called "महाकवि" and his present poem is called "सुकविरचना" in the last verse 104. We must, therefore, search for any other works of this poet, if they can be traced in any libraries, private or public. For the present the B. O. R. Institute MS. of the *S'ṛṅgāra-Kallola* remains as a unique MS. of Rāyabhaṭṭa's only available work. As this poem is written in a delightful style with elegant diction it deserves to be published early. I have, therefore, persuaded Prof. N. A. Gore of the S. P. College to edit it and I hope he will publish it in some journal at an early date.

[1] Rāyaṃbhaṭṭa, author of यतिसंस्कारप्रयोग mentioned by Aufrecht (*CC. I*, 526) is evidently a different person (from Rāyabhaṭṭa the author of the **SK.**).

PANTOBHAṬṬA, ḌHUṆḌHIRĀJA AND VAIDYANĀTHA

By K. Madhava Krishna Sarma*

1. Pantobhaṭṭa

Pantobhaṭṭa, alias Vires'vara was a scion of the celebrated family of the Bhaṭṭas of Benares. He was the son of Lakṣmaṇabhaṭṭa, author of the commentary *Gūḍhārthakās'ikā* or Naiṣadhaprakās'a on the *Naiṣadhīyacarita* of S'rīharṣa, of which there are MSS.[1] in the Anup Sanskrit Library. Lakṣmaṇabhaṭṭa was the son of Rāmakṛṣṇabhaṭṭa, son of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa.

Pantobhaṭṭa was a protégé of Mahārājā Anup Singh of Bikaner. In collaboration with Mahādeva, son of Dinakara and also a protégé of Anup Singh, he wrote a commentary on the *Sūryāruṇasaṁvāda*, *Cakra-Cūḍāmaṇi* or *Jñānabhāskara*, entitled *Sūryāruṇakeralīyaṭīkā*. There is a MS. of the commentary in the Anup Sanskrit Library, No. 1649. It has 59 folios containing Adhyāyas 1-11. Most part of the work, *viz.* Adhyāyas 1-8 is by Pantobhaṭṭa. At the end of this portion there is the colophon :—

इति श्रीमीमांसाद्वैतसाम्राज्यधुरंधर श्रीभट्टनारायणात्मजभट्टरामकृष्णात्मजभट्टलक्ष्मणात्मजपन्तोभट्टकृते सूर्यारुणसंवादविवरणे अष्टमः संपूर्णः ॥ श्रीः ॥ महाराजाधिराजमहाराजश्री ४ अनूपसिंहजी पुस्तिका लिखापिता औरङ्गाबाद्मध्ये ॥ लिखितं मथेन सांवलः ॥ This is folio 26. Folio 27 begins in a different hand :

[1] See my note in the *Poona Orientalist*, Vol. X, pp. 81-82.

साम्राज्यं भुवि भुज्यतां कविसुधावाणी सदा श्रूयतां
सारासारविचारचञ्चुरतया लोकाः पदं ? पाल्यताम् ।
धीरोदारगुणान्विनेन भवता भव्यं यशो लभ्यतां
पूर्वेषामनुपाल्यतामनुदिनं धर्मस्त्वया सेव्यताम् ॥

On folio 30*b* :

इति श्रीमहाराजाधिराजमहाराज श्रीअनूपसिंहकृतकेरळीकर्मविपाकनवमाध्यायव्याख्यायां० ॥ This is repeated at the end of each section of the ninth Adhyāya. It ends folio 50 where also the same colophon is found; but here it is followed by

यो वेदान्तमहाम्बुधौ विजयते सेतुस्तथा गौतम-
व्याख्याने महिते समस्तविदिते तन्त्रेऽर्थदाता मणिः ।
मीमांसाम्बुनिधेः प्रहर्षजनने चन्द्रः सुरैः संस्तुतो
विद्वद्वैदिकमण्डनो दिनकरः श्रीपण्डितप्रीतिदः ॥
तस्यात्मजेन महादेवेनाकारि टिप्पणमिदम् ॥

The tenth Adhyāya (foll. 51-57) is in a third hand and does not mention the author. On the front page of the MS. there is the following entry:

महाराज श्रीअनोपसिंहजीकारित नारायणभट्टान्वयसंभूतपंतोजीभट्टकृतसूर्यारुणकेरली री टीका ॥

The MS. begins :

रामं गणेशं पितरौ नत्वा वीरेश्वरः सुधीः ।
करोति शिष्टेष्टतुष्टचै व्याख्यां सूर्यारुणदीधितिम ॥

पुंस इति । वर्णमात्रगणनाकृतफल एवाद्याक्षरत्यागः । तेन गणप्रयुक्तं गुरुलघुकृतं विकृताविकृतस्वरकृतं चाद्यस्वरेऽपि फलं भवत्येव । जगणश्चेदिति । लघुरपि गणोत्तरो ग्राह्यः ॥

Ends:

मन्मन्त्रपाठेन गायत्र्या विना वैदिककर्मसु मध्ये अन्यत्पापनाशनं नास्तीत्यर्थः । सवनात्कार्योत्पादनात् । मन्मन्त्रं गायत्रीं चतुर्विंशत्यक्षरात्मकः । गायन्तं त्रायति इति गायत्र्या गायत्री । त्वमिति निरुक्तम् । शूद्रादीनां तु स्मृत्युक्तं प्रायश्चित्तं कार्यमिति भावः । इति विवरणे एकादशोऽध्यायः ॥

Under the patronage of Mahārāja Anup Singh Panto-bhaṭṭa wrote also another work, *viz.* the *Ekādaśīnirṇaya* as a part of his *Samayakalpataru*. There is a MS. of this also in the Anup Sanskrit Library. It is numbered 2654. It has 13 folios containing nearly 300 granthas. As its name indicates, the work deals with the Nirṇaya of Ekādaśī. There are references to Mādhavīya, Hemādri, etc.

Begins:

सिन्दूरारुणगण्डं देवं रामं च जानकीयुक्तम् ।
मर्दितलङ्कानाथं वन्देऽहं मातरं काशीम् ॥
नारायणं तं प्रपितामहं च पितामहं विश्रुतरामकृष्णम् ।
श्रीलक्ष्मणाख्यं पितरं प्रणम्य चैकादशीनिर्णयमातनोमि ॥

Ends:

आसीत्सर्वमहीपदर्पहुतभुङ्निर्वापधाराधरो
दानाम्भोधरवारिवृद्धिनिवहत्कीर्तिद्रुमालंकृतः ।
लक्ष्मीकान्तपदारविन्दयुगलभ्राम्यद्द्विरेफोत्तमः
शूरः श्रीनृपकर्णभूमिमघवा विद्वज्जनानन्दनः ॥

एकादश्याः कृतोऽस्माभिर्निर्णयः शास्त्रसंमतः ।
नृपेन्द्रचूडामणिना सोत्साहं दृश्यतामयम् ॥

इति लक्ष्मणभट्टात्मजपन्तोजीभट्ठो . . . समयकल्पतरौ एकादशीगुच्छः समाप्तः ॥

2. DHUṆḌHIRĀJA

Pantobhaṭṭa's son Ḍhuṇḍhirāja wrote the *Rājaratnākara*, a work on precious stones under the orders of Garībadāsa, a priest of Mahārāṇa Rājasiṁha of Mewar. This has been noticed by me under *Anūparatnākara* in the *Adyar Library Bulletin* (May, 1946, pp. 106 ff.). Ḍhuṇḍhirāja says:—

गरीबदासाख्यपुरोहिताज्ञया श्रीराजरत्नाकर एष निर्मितः ।
रत्नाकरस्तस्य करोतु भव्यं श्रीराजसिंहस्य चिरं प्रसन्नः ॥

As stated by me in my note on the *Anūparatnākara* of Vaidyanātha, the *Rājaratnākara* is incorporated in that work, and in the MS. noticed by me, the above verse is rubbed over by pigment. The identity of Ḍhuṇḍhirāja was not clear from that MS. I have now come across an independent MS. of *Rājaratnākara* (No. 3972) in the Library which begins as follows:—

ख्यातः सर्वमहीपदर्पहुतभुङ्निर्वापधाराधरो
दानाम्भोधरवारिवर्धितबृहत्कीर्तिद्रुमालंकृतः ।
गौरीकान्तपदारविन्दयुगले भ्राम्यद्द्विरेफोत्तमः
शूरः श्रीनृपराजसिंहमघवा विद्वज्जनानन्दनः ॥

(Compare this with the verse at the beginning of his father's *Ekādaśīnirṇaya*).

आसीद्भट्टकुले हि लक्ष्मणबुधो मीमांसकालंकृति-
स्तत्सूनुः किल सर्वशास्त्रनिपुणो वीरेश्वराख्यः कृती ।

तज्जातः किल ढुण्ढिराजविबुधः श्रीमद्गरीबाज्ञया
राज्ञां धारणयोग्यरत्नविषये ब्रूते मितं साम्प्रतम् ॥ २ ॥

Ends:

गरीबदासाख्यपुरोहिताज्ञया ० ॥

इति श्रीमहाराजाधिराजमहाराणा श्रीमदवर्नान्द्र श्रीराजसिंहीयसकलकलानिधानभूतद्विजवर्यपुरोहितगरीबदासाज्ञया मीमांसकपन्तोभट्टात्मजभट्टढुण्ढिराजकृते राजरत्नाकरे नवरत्नपरीक्षायां मणिप्रतिपादकस्तरङ्गः समाप्तः । समाप्तश्चायं ग्रन्थः ॥

3. VAIḌYANĀTHABHAṬṬA

Mahārāja Anup Singh had contact with another member also of the Bhaṭṭa family, namely, Vaidyanātha, son of Anantabhaṭṭa son of Kamalākarabhaṭṭa. He presented some MSS. to the King, as is borne out by the following endorsement in Nos. 2549 and 2554 (*Madanārṇava* and *Rājadharma Kaustubha*): श्रीअनूपसिंहमहाप्रभुयोग्यमिदं पुस्तकं अनंतभट्टसुतवैद्यनाथभट्टेन दत्तं ॥ There is also a MS. of the *Yaśavantabhāskara* in the Library (No. 2552) which was owned by Vaidyanātha. In the *Poona Orientalist* I have already noticed a MS. of the *Vedāntakautūhala* a rare work of Kamalākara, which is now available in the Anup Sanskrit Library. I have also noticed there the oldest known MS. of Kamalākara's work available in the Library. These MSS. (from the Bhaṭṭas who were leading authorities on Dharmaśāstra and Mīmāṃsā for generations), are very important.

[The sanskrit portion is written exactly as it is found in the MS, and the mistakes are not corrected.—Ed.]

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The first sixteen pages of the *Descriptive Catalogue of Pali Manuscripts* in the Adyar Library, in Sinhalese script, have been inserted in this issue of the *Bulletin*. It is proposed to continue the work through the *Bulletin* as a serial. The collection now catalogued was presented to the President-Founder Colonel Olcott by Mrs. Ilangakoon of Ceylon. We are grateful to Dr. E. W. Adikaram, M.A., Ph.D., Principal, Ānanda S'āstrālaya, Kotte, Ceylon, for preparing the Descriptive Catalogue of these Pali manuscripts in Sinhalese script and pushing it through the press during the period of his stay at Adyar and elsewhere in India.

JAIPUR LIBRARY

In the last issue it was announced that the Jaipur State has made arrangements for the proper organization of the rich collection of Manuscripts in the Palace. Our Editor Dr. C. Kunhan Raja has already proceeded to the place to organize the Library and to prepare a list, and the work has now been started. His experience in the Adyar Library for well over twenty years and his work in connection with the organization of the Library in Bikaner State will be of great help to him in this heavy undertaking. When properly arranged, this new Manuscripts Library will take its place among the great Libraries of India and of the world. It is estimated that the Library contains over ten thousand manuscripts.

DIRECTOR,

Adyar Library

MANUSCRIPTS NOTES

A VARIANT VERSION OF THE KAVIRĀKṢASĪYA

By H. G. Narahari

We seem to owe the *Kavirākṣasīya* to the Āndhra country. The author of this interesting gnomic poem appears to be a well-known Telugu poet, though his exact date is still unknown. All that can be said[1] concerning his age is that he lived some time after Nannayya Bhaṭṭa and before Tikkana Somayāji. He is known to belong to the place called Drākṣārāma and to have composed also the *Ādinārāyaṇacarita*, a work on Poetics.

Of his *Kavirākṣasīya* at least two different versions are already well-known. That printed in Telugu characters seems to be the earlier edition, while the Devanāgarī edition was published by the Nirnayasagara Press, Bombay, in 1901; the former of these editions has also the additional merit of publishing[2] the commentary of Nāganārya, son of Devaṇārādhya. A third edition of the poem was started by Mr. Y. Mahalinga Sastri in the now defunct *Calcutta Oriental Journal* during the years 1935-36. Only the first 24 verses are edited and annotated there. I do not know if this edition was subsequently completed.

A text quite different from that known from either of the two printed editions known to me is given in a MS. deposited in the

[1] Veeresalingam Pantulu, *Telugu Poets*, I. 670.

[2] M. Krishnamachariar (*Classical Sanskrit Literature*, p. 379) does not seem to be aware that this commentary has already been published. He also speaks of the existence of two more anonymous commentaries on the work.

Adyar Library. It is an incomplete palm-leaf MS. written in Malayalam characters and consisting of 3 folia. It bears the shelf-number XXI. Q. 8. Size, 14″×1.9″. Lines, 12-13 in a page. Inked. In the present paper my attempt is to give a brief idea of the variations of this MS. (M.) as compared with the Telugu edition (T). It is not proposed to make an exhaustive collation of the two. I shall note below only the more important of the *Varietas Lectiones*, especially the extra verses the MS. contains as compared with the printed text accepted by the commentator Nāganārya :

1. M. opens with the verse

त्रयीयुवतिसीमन्तसीमा सिन्दूरबन्धवः ।
संसाराब्धि पिबेयुर्वः कंसारेः पादपांसवः ॥

This is not found in T.

2. After the verse शब्दशक्त्यैव० (T. 2), M. has the verse

ईप्सन्ति यां सुमनसः सर्वदानवहर्षदाम् ।
जीवतोऽपि कवेः कीर्ति सा विद्या सा हि वाङ्मृची ॥

which is absent in T.

3. The verse

दुष्टानां परहिंसार्थे निस्त्रिंशानां ध्रुवं कृता ।
स्वमात्रा वर्यितेनैव यसा तीक्ष्णमुखे . . . ॥

which occurs in M. after the verse मधुव्रताश्च० (T. 11) is not found in T.

4. After the verse महाप्रभञ्जन० (T. 13) M. has the extra verse

शुनां च पिशुनानां च प्रतिवेश्म प्रवेशिनाम् ।
प्रयोजनं न पश्यामः पात्राणां दूषणादृते ॥

5. Between the verse अदाक्षिण्यात्॰ (T. 20) and the verse दुर्जनैश्च॰ (T. 21) eleven verses intervene in M. Seven of these occur elsewhere in T. but the following four are not to be found there :

(*a*) विशेषः स महानस्ति खलस्य च घटस्य च ।
पूर्वो विपाके विरसः परस्तु रसभाजनम् ॥

(*b*) शालयश्च सुशीलाश्च खलेन प्राप्य सङ्गमम् ।
पुरुषर्षभलङ्घ्यत्वं यान्ति निश्शूकतां गताः ॥

(*c*) कुविद्वांश्च कुमुद्वांश्च राजालोकादितस्मयः ।
अप्रबुद्धतया कुर्यान्नित्यं नरविमाननाम् ॥

(*d*) ये जना भृशमन्दाक्षाः सूर्यालोकोत्थकोपतः ।
न ते तस्य परिस्फूर्तिमभिनन्दन्ति भास्वतः ॥

6. The verse (T. 21)

दुर्जनैश्च द्विरेफैश्च मलिनैस्सुमनोगणः ।
आत्तगन्धोपि सहजं मार्दवं न विमुञ्चति ॥

reads in M. thus :

आत्तगन्धोऽपि सहजं मार्दवं न विमुञ्चति ।
मुक्तामृणालसुधियां निर्मलानां निसर्गतः ॥

7. In place of the verse (T. 22)

गम्भीरं च प्रसन्नं च धनिनो माननं महत् ।
द्विजानामुपकाराय शुचीनां केन निर्मितम् ॥

M. has the line

छिद्रं यदि स्यात्तत्क्षुद्रं गुणैस्तच्चयभिधीयते ।

8. In M. the verses क्षीणस्नेहो॰ (T. 31), अमन्दतर॰ (T. 34) and निशातमसि (T. 35) are absent.

9. Among the thirty-one verses which follow the verse **पश्यन्०** (T. 37) in M., the following nine verses are not found in T.:

(*a*) प्रसादातिशयेनान्तर्विष्फुरत्सत्त्वसंपदः ।
न दीना भङ्गवन्तोऽपि साधवः सिन्धवो यथा ॥

(*b*) निरस्तदोषा गौर्यस्य नित्यं नालीकबोधनम् ।
प्रभावान्मान एवासौ पुरुषः साधु मङ्गले ॥

(*c*) क्षतानां हृदये गाढं सदसि क्षेपकारिभिः ।
महतामरुषां सत्यं शान्तिरेव सुखावहा ॥

(*d*) स्वशाखाभिर्विवृण्वानान् फलप्रसवसंपदः ।
प्राप्यागमान् द्विजः कुर्यात् कुलस्य सुखमात्मनः ॥

(*e*) शुचिर्यो यज्वनां नेता क्षीणो वा पूर्ण एव वा ।
स देहयात्रां कुरुते मार्गमुत्तारमाश्रयन् ॥

(*f*) भोगो यस्य सदा हेयः प्रियस्यान्नित्यमस्थितः ।
स सर्वमङ्गलोपेतोप्यपश्यं स्यादकिञ्चनः ॥

(*g*) अहीनां पावनीं वृत्तिं नित्यं लब्धवतामपि ।
निराशीष्टमशान्तानां नैव स्याद्भोगसङ्गिनाम् ॥

(*h*) स्वैरमादानलज्वालादुष्प्रेक्षः परुषं नदन् ।
उत्पाताभ्रवदाशानां निरोधाय दुरीश्वरः ॥

(*i*) अतिवेलं पीडयतां स्फीतमन्योन्यमण्डलम् ।
कुचानां कुनृपाणाञ्च पतनाय समुच्छ्रयः ॥

GAUTAMA DHARMA SŪTRA—MANUSCRIPTS IN THE ADYAR LIBRARY

BY A. N. KRISHNA AIYANGAR

1. The earliest of the dharma-sūtras is the Gautama-dharma-sūtra. It is considered to be specially sacred to the followers of the Sāmaveda.[1] The Baudhāyana-dharma-sūtra has specific references to the views of Gautama. Manu and Yājñavalkya and Vasistha mention *Gautama* as an ancient writer on *dharma*.[2] It is written entirely in prose, unlike the dharma-sūtras of Baudhayana and Āpastamba which contain verses as well. The date of the work is placed so early as between B.C. 600 to 400.[3]

2. Manuscripts of the work are not hard to obtain and the work has been printed several times. The edition of the *Gautama-dharma-sūtra* by Stenzler in 1876 and the publication of the collection of smṛti texts by Jivananda Vidyasagara in the same year containing the *Gautama-dharma-sūtra* also, under the name *Gautama-saṃhitā*, supplied the needs of the scholars of the day. Two notable commentaries on Gautama are known, one by Haradatta and the second by Maskari. The first was published as No. 61 of the Ānanadās'rama Sanskrit Series in 1910. The bhāṣya of Maskari was made available to the scholars in the Mysore series, in 1917. An English translation of the work was published in the Sacred Books of the East Series as Vol. II.

3. Aufrecht notes a third commentary on Gautama by Kulamani S'ukla.[4] Manuscripts of this work do not seem to be commonly available in the south. There is only one entry in Aufrecht and that from the North West.

4. The Adyar Library contains twenty-two manuscripts of the *Gautama-dharma-sūtra*. Thirteen manuscripts contain the

[1] *S. B. E.* II, p. xlv,
[2] *S. B. E.* II, pp. xlviii to liii.
[3] Kane, *Hist. of Dharma S'astra*, Vol. I, p. 19.
[4] Aufrecht, *CC*, I, p, 171 *a*.

sūtra portion only.[1] Five manuscripts represent the work with the commentary of Haradatta.[2] The Āhnika-sūtra or the *Kriyā* kāṇḍa is represented by two manuscripts[3] and the paris'iṣṭa by two other manuscripts.[4] As regards the scripts used, twelve manuscripts are in Grantha, nine manuscripts in Telugu, and one manuscript in Devanāgari. There are four paper manuscripts[5] and eighteen palm-leaf manuscripts. Another palm-leaf manuscript containing the *Mitākṣarā* of Haradatta has recently been added but has not been examined in detail.[6]

5. The *Gautama-dharma-sūtra* contains twenty-eight chapters as commented upon by Haradatta and published in the Ānandās'rama series. The group of manuscripts with the commentary of Haradatta have the same 28 chapters. A detailed examination with the printed version of the work has shown that the manuscripts will be of very great value for collation for future editions of the work. In certain cases it has been found that the commentary as found in the manuscripts contain not only important additions and variations but even a different version of Haradatta. For comparison I reproduce below the commentary on the first sūtra of the second adhyāya in both the printed text and one of the manuscripts, *i.e.* 29. K. 17.[7]

Ānandās'rama edition, p. 12 :

प्रागुपनयनात् कामचारः कामवादः कामभक्षः ॥ २, १ ।

आषोडशाद्ब्राह्मणस्येत्यापत्कल्पोपनयनविषयम् । कामचार इच्छाचरणम् । अपण्यान्यपि विक्रीणीयात श्ववृत्यापि जीवेदिति । कामवादोऽश्लीला-

[1] 21. C. 6, 21. C. 19, 21. C. 20, 21, C. 22, 21. C. 24. 21, C. 29, 22. L. 59, 26. L. 1, 29. A. 24, 29. K. 17, 30. H. 22, and 21. C. 23.

[2] 8. I. 13, 24. M. 5, 27, G. 46, 29. K, 17 and 30 H. 18.

[3] 8. D. 55 and 9 F. 70.

[4] 9. I. 18 and 24 G. 18.

[5] The four paper manuscripts bear the following Shelf numbers: 8. D. 55, 9. F. 70, 9. I. 18, 8. H. 32. The rest are palm-leaf manuscripts.

[6] This bears Shelf No. 34. K. 6.

[7] Folio 6 of 29. K. 17.

नृतादिवचनम् । कामभक्षो लशुनपर्युषितान्नादिभक्षणं चतुःपञ्चकृत्वो वा भोजनमित्येतावद्यस्य स तथोक्तः । न तु ब्रह्महत्यासुरापानाद्यतिप्रसङ्गः ॥ १ ॥

29. K 17. (folio 6*b*):

प्रागुपनयानात् कामचारवादभक्षः ॥

आपत्कल्पस्योपनयनग्रहणम् । आषोडशाद्ब्राह्मणस्येत्यादि । अब्रह्मचारीति लिङ्गान्न हि रिस्यात् कालात्प्राक् स्त्रीगमनस्य प्रसंगोऽस्ति । काम इच्छाचरणम् । वादनं भक्षम् । असावङ्गारकालानुगुणाश्चारादयो यस्य स कामचारवादभक्षः । कामचारः अपण्यान्यपि विक्रीणीत अन्यं प्रत्याजीवेत् । कामवादः अश्लीलानृतं रसिकमपि वदेत् । काल(म)भक्षः लशुनमपि भक्षेत् । पञ्चकृत्वोऽह्नि भुञ्जीत पर्युषितादिकं च, नास्य कश्चित्कृतो नियमः । यच्च ब्राह्मणवर्णोद्देशेन विधीयते प्रतिषिद्ध्यते च तदप्यस्य न भवति । अतो न तदतिक्रमे राज्ञा दण्डो, न प्रायश्चित्तम् ।

Part of the commentary on sūtra 6 in the printed version is brought under sūtra 4:

Ānandāsrama edition, pp. 12-13:

यथोपपादितमूत्रपुरीषो भवति ॥ २, ४. ।

मूत्रपुरीषे यथोपपद्येते यस्य स तथोक्तः प्राङ्मुखादिरपि कुर्यात् । न भूमावनन्तर्धायेत्यादि स्थाननियमोऽपि नास्ति ।

नास्याचमनकल्पो विद्यते ॥ २, ५. ।

.कल्पनिषेधादाचमनमनुज्ञातं स्त्रीशूद्रवत् ।

अन्यत्रापमार्जनप्रधावनावोक्षणेभ्यः ॥ २, ६. ।

अपमार्जनादीनि वर्जयित्वाचमनकल्पो नास्ति । अपमार्जनादिकमस्तीति यावत् । यद्यप्यपमार्जनादीन्याचमनकल्पे नान्तर्भवन्ति तथापि पर्युदासमुखेन तानि विधीयन्ते । अत्र मार्जनं सोदकेन पाणिना परिमार्जनमुच्छिष्टादिलिप्तस्य । प्रधावनममेध्यादिलिप्तस्याद्भिर्मृदा च क्षालनम् । .अवोक्षणं रजस्व-

लादिस्पृष्टस्य । इदमत्यन्तबालविषयम् । षड्वर्षादूर्ध्वं स्नानमिच्छन्ति । अस्यानुपनीतस्यैतावदुक्तमात्रकामचारादिव्यतिक्रमे प्रायश्चित्तमस्ति । तत्र स्मृत्यन्तरे— अशीतिर्यस्य वर्षाणि बालो वाप्यूनषोडशः । प्रायश्चित्तार्धमर्हन्ति स्त्रियो व्याधित एव च ॥ ऊनैकादशवर्षस्य पञ्चवर्षात्परस्य च । चरेद् गुरुः सुहृच्चैव प्रायश्चित्तं विशुद्धये ॥ अतो बालतरस्यास्य नापराधो न पातकम् । राजदण्डश्च तस्यातः प्रायश्चित्तं च नेष्यते ॥ इति ।

21. K. 17, folio *6b*:

यथोपपादितमूत्रपुरीषो भवति ॥ २, ४ ।

मूत्रपुरीषौ यथोपपद्येते यस्य स तथोक्तः । न भूमावनन्तर्धायेत्यादिस्थाननियमोऽपि नास्ति । रुषितप्राङ्मुखस्य पथिकृष्टादौ वा तथैव ते कुर्यात् । कामचारस्यायमुदाहरणोपन्यासः एवंजातीयं कामचारमपि वीक्षितमिति दर्शयितुम् । तेन ब्रह्महत्यासुरापानादि नैवास्यानुज्ञायते । तत्करणे प्रायश्चित्तं भवत्येव ।

अशीतिर्यस्य वर्षाणि बालो वाप्यूनषोडशः ।
प्रायश्चित्तार्धमर्हन्ति स्त्रियो रोगिण एव च ॥ इति ।
ऊनैकादशवर्षस्य पञ्चवर्षात्परस्य च ।
चरेद्गुरुः सुहृच्चैव प्रायश्चित्तं विशुद्धये ॥
अतो बालतरस्यास्य नापराधो न पातकम् ।
राजदण्डश्च तस्यातः प्रायश्चित्तं तु नेष्यते ॥ इति ।

अतोऽत्र यद्यपि सामान्येन प्रागुपनयनादित्युक्तम् । तथापि षष्ठाद्वर्षात्प्रागेव कामचारादि द्रष्टव्यम् । ततः परं पित्र्यादिभिर्वर्णधर्मेषु नियोक्तव्यः । अनुयुञ्जानास्तु प्रायश्चित्तिनो दण्ड्याश्च ॥

नास्याचमनकल्पो विद्यते ॥ २, ५ ।

अन्यत्रापामार्जनप्रधावनावोक्षणेभ्यः ॥ २, ६ ।

प्राङ्मुखोदङ्मुखो वेत्येवमादि प्रागुक्त आचमनकल्पोऽस्यानुपनीतस्य न विद्यते । कल्पप्रतिषेधादाचमनमात्रमनुज्ञायते । तदर्थमेवेदं वचनम् । कल्पस्य प्राप्त्यभावात् । तच्च स्त्रीशूद्रौ सकृदिति । तच्च—

'स्त्री शूद्रेण समं तावद्यावद्वेदो न जायते' ।

इति दर्शनात् । किमविशेषणास्याचमनकल्पो न विद्यते । अन्यत्रापामार्जनादिभ्य: । यद्यप्यपामर्जनादय: आचमनकल्पे नान्तर्भवन्ति तथापि पर्युदासमुखेन ते विधीयन्ते । तत्रापामार्जनमुच्छिष्टलिप्तस्य हस्तादे: सोदकेन पाणिना शोधनम् । प्रधावनममेध्यादिलिप्तस्याद्भि: मृदा च प्रक्षालनम् । अवोक्षणमिदमत्यन्तबालविषयम् । षष्ठाद्वर्षादूर्ध्वं समानमिच्छन्ति ॥

These variations on a large scale which are only cited as samples tend to strengthen the impression that the present manuscript represents a different version of the work.

6. Some manuscripts of the *Gautama-dharma-sūtra* classify the contents of the work under the general divisions of Ācāra, Vyavahāra and Prāyas'citta. The first section ends with the 9th chapter, the second with the 19th chapter and the third section consists of the remaining nine chapters. Eight manuscripts specifically mention this classification in their colophons.[1] Of these, five are in Grantha script and the other three in Telugu. The two printed editions of Haradatta and Maskari do not specify this classification in their colophons.

7. In two of the manuscripts[2] in the Library there is *an additional sūtra* at the end of the seventeenth chapter. But this appears as part of the commentary of Haradatta on the last sūtra of the section in the Ānandās'rama edition. The manuscripts write this portion as a sūtra and repeat the last word twice to point out that it is a sūtra and that the repetition is intended to denote the end of the chapter. The sūtra and the portion of the commentary of Haradatta are reproduced below for comparison :

folio 11*b* of manuscript *21. C. 6.*

न ? (अ)तिथीनभ्याशयेत् भक्षयेद्भक्षयेच्च ।

[1] The eight manuscripts are indicated by the following Shelf Numbers 21. C. 6, 21. C. 20, 21. C. 24, 22. L. 59, 26. L. 1. 30. H. 22. 27. G. 46, and 39. K. 17.

[2] Manuscripts Nos. 21. C. 6 and 26 L. 1.

folio 23*a* of *26. L. 1.*

अतिथीनप्याशयेद्भक्षयेच्च ।

Ānandās'rama edition, p. 147.

व्यालहताद्दृष्टदोषवाक्प्रशस्तानभ्युक्ष्योपयुञ्जीतोपयुञ्जीत ॥ ३८ ॥

अतिथीनप्याशयेद्भक्षयेच्च । न तु श्वादेरुच्छिष्टमिति वर्जयेत् । मनुरप्याह—-etc.

8. The Calcutta edition of the *Gautama-dharma-sūtra* (already noticed as published under the title *Gautama Saṃhitā*) contains an additional chapter bringing the total to 29 chapters.[1] This additional chapter is inserted between the 19th and the 20th chapters of the Mysore and Ānandās'rama editions. Neither Haradatta nor Maskari has commented on this chapter which should account for the omission of the chapter in the two editions. The tradition adding this additional chapter does not seem to be confined to north Indian manuscripts used by Jīvananda Vidyasagara as there are in the Adyar Library eleven manuscripts which contain this portion as the 20th chapter of the work. There are seven manuscripts in Grantha and four in Telugu script.[2] Thus the tradition seems to be a common one throughout the country. Professor Kane notes this chapter as dealing with Karmavipāka.[3] Why the two commentators have omitted the extra chapter remains to be explained.

9. Chapters dealing with *karmavipāka* form part of treatises on dharma and such sections are observable in other works also. The *Visnu-dharma-sūtra* after dealing with *Narakas*[4] in the forty-third chapter devotes two chapters the forty-fourth for describing the low births to which a sinner is assigned for various sins after expiation in the Hell, and the forty-fifth[5] dealing with the

[1] *Dharma S'āstra Samgraha*, Vol. II, (1876), pp. 403-434 ; Dharma Sastra Text, M. N. Dutt, (1908), Vol. 1, pp. 377-404.

[2] See p. 205 for their numbers.

[3] Kane, *Hist. of Dharma Sāstra*, Vol. I, p. 14.

[4] *Viṣnudharma Sūtra*, ed. Jolly, (1881). pp. 97-100,

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 100-102.

various diseases of the sinners who are born in this world as men. The need for the performance of *prāyaścitta* is all the more stressed from this point of view as well.

10. As such, the place given to the additional section in the *Gautama-dharma-sūtra*—seems fitting. A comparison with the *Viṣṇu-dharma sūtra* shows that there is difference of opinion as well as agreement between Gautama and Viṣṇu. Thus one who drank prohibited drinks in a past life was indicated by bad teeth both according to Gautama and Viṣṇu. But a *guru-talpaka* is indicated by lameness and blindness according to the section in Gautama, whereas Viṣṇu indicates him by vitiated skin. Other cases of agreement are found in *pūtināsa*, *pūtivaktra*, *mūka*, *mṛgavyādha* etc. But another instance of disagreement is found in sūtra 22 of Viṣṇu which corresponds to sūtra 17 of Gautama.

11. This section of *Gautama-dharma-sūtra* is not easily available as it was first published seventy years ago and the later texts of Gautama have omitted it. I have therefore taken advantage of the presence of eleven manuscripts in the Library and collated all of them. I have also compared the text now presented with the text of the Calcutta editions of both Jivananda Vidyasagara and Manmatha Nath Dutt. The following symbols have been used to indicate the manuscripts and their readings :

Manuscript No.	21 C 6	Telugu script		(Ka) क
,,	21 C 19	Grantha	,,	(Kha) ख
,,	21 C 20	,,	,,	(Ga) ग
,,	21 C 24	,,	,,	(Gha) घ
,,	22 L 59	,,	,,	(Ṅa) ङ
,,	26 L 1	,,	,,	(Ca) च
,,	26 L 2	,,	,,	(Cha) छ
,,	29 A 24	Telugu	,,	(Ja) ज
,,	29 K 17	,,	,,	(Jha) झ

Manuscript No.	30 H 22	Grantha script (Jña) ञ
,,	21 C 23	Telugu ,, (Ṭa) ट

12. The variations from the printed texts of Jivananda and M. N. Dutt are indicated under Mu. Pā. (*Mudrita pāṭha*). मु. पा.

गौतमधर्मसूत्रम्

प्रायश्चित्ताध्यायः

प्रथमः खण्डः

अथ चतुःषष्टिषु यातनास्थानेषु दुःखान्यनुभूय[1] तत्रेमानि लक्षणानि भवन्ति ॥ १ ॥

[2]ब्रह्महार्द्रकुष्ठी ॥ २ ॥

सुरापः श्यावदन्तः ॥ ३ ॥

गुरुतल्पगः पङ्ग्वन्धः[3] ॥ ४ ॥

[4]स्वर्णापहारी कुनखी ॥ ५ ॥

[5]श्वित्री वस्त्रापहारी ॥ ६ ॥

हिरण्यहारी दर्दुरी ॥ ७ ॥

तेजोऽपहारी मण्डली[6] ॥ ८ ॥

[1] यतेऽत्रेमानि—च. छ.

[2] ब्रह्महा कुष्ठी—ग.

[3] पङ्गुः—मु. पा.

[4] स्वर्णहारी—ख. घ ; मु. पा ; सुवर्णहारी—ङ. ज. ञ.

[5] श्वेती—क.

[6] वण्डली—ङ.

स्नेहापहारी क्षयिता[1] ॥ ९ ॥

अजीर्णवानन्नापहारी ॥ १० ॥

[2]ज्ञानापहारी मूकः ॥ ११ ॥

प्रतिहन्ता गुरोरपस्मारी ॥ १२ ॥

गोघ्नो जात्यन्धः ॥ १३ ॥

पिशुनः पूतिनासः ॥ १४ ॥

पूतिवक्त्रस्तु सूचकः ॥ १५ ॥

शूद्रोपाध्यायः श्वपाकः ॥ १६ ॥

[3]त्रपुचामरसीसविक्रयी मद्यपः ॥ १७ ॥

एकशफविक्रयी मृगव्याधः ॥ १८ ॥

कुण्डाशी भृतकस्तैलिको[4] वा ॥ १९ ॥

[5]नाक्षत्री श्वार्बुदी[6] ॥ २० ॥

नास्तिको रङ्गोपजीवी ॥ २१ ॥

अभक्ष्यभक्षी गण्डली[7] ॥ २२ ॥

ब्रह्मपुरुषतस्कराणां देशिकः पिण्डहरः[8] ॥ २३ ॥

षण्डो महापथिकः ॥ २४ ॥

[1] क्षुधिता—झ ; क्षयी-मु. पा ; तथाजीर्ण—मु. पा.

[2] ज्ञानहारी—ग.

[3] त्रपुसीसचामरविक्रयी—घ. मु. पा.

[4] भृतकश्शैल्किो—ग ; भृतकश्चैल्किो—घ. झ. ञ. मु. पा.

[5] नक्षत्री—छ. ट. मु. पा.

[6] श्वार्बुदी—क ; श्वार्बुरी—ङ. ञ.

[7] गण्डूरी—ख ; गण्डुरी—ग. ङ. झ. ञ ; गन्धूरी—ज ; गण्डरी—मु. पा.

[8] पीलवः—क. ट. च. छ ; पीडवः—ङ. झ ; पिण्डवः—ज ; पिड्वः—ञ ;
पिण्डतः—मु. पा.

[1]दण्डिकश्चाण्डालीपुल्कसीगोष्ववकीर्णी ॥ २५ ॥

[2]मध्वामेही हि धर्मपत्नीषु स्यान्मैथुनप्रवर्तकः[3] ॥ २६ ॥

[4]खर्वाटः [5]सगोत्रसमवयःस्त्र्यभिगामी ॥ २७ ॥

[6]श्रीमतीमातृभगिनीभ्रातृभगिनीष्वभिगम्याबीजिनः ॥ २८ ॥

तेषां [7]कुब्जकुण्डमण्डव्याधितव्यङ्गदरिद्राल्पायुषोऽल्पबुद्धयः[8] शठपण्डशैलूषतस्करपरपुरुषप्रेष्यपरकर्मकराः [9]खल्वाटनक्तंचरानृशंससंकीर्णकूट[10]कर्माणः [11]क्रमतश्चान्त्याश्चोपपद्यन्ते ॥ २९ ॥

तस्मात् कर्तव्यमेवेह प्रायश्चित्तम् ॥ ३० ॥

विशुद्धैर्लक्षणैर्जायन्ते धर्मस्य धारणादिति [12]धर्मस्य धारणादिति ॥ ३१ ॥

प्रथमः खण्डः[13]

[1] गण्डिक—ख. मु. पा.

[2] मर्धांमेही धर्म—क. छ ; मध्वामेही—मु. पा ; मध्वामेषी—ख.

[3] प्रवृत्तः—ख.

[4] खल्वाटः—ग.

[5] सगोत्रसवयःस्त्र्यभिगामी—झ.

[6] श्रीपतिमातृ—क ; श्रीमतीमातृ—ट ; श्रीपतिमातृभगिनीष्वभिगम्या—ख ; श्रीपतिमातृभगिनीभ्रातृभगिन्याभिजनः—क. ट ; श्रीमतीमातृभगिनीभ्रातृभगिनीस्वभिगाम्यगम्यागाम्यश्वबीजिनः—ख. घ. ङ. ञ ; श्रीमतीमातृभगिन्याबीजिनः—ग. छ. ज ; पितृमातृ—मु. पा.

[7] कुब्जकुष्ठषण्डमण्ड—क. ज ; कुब्जकुष्ठमण्ड—च.

[8] अल्पबुद्धयश्च षण्डपण्ड—क. ज ; अल्पबुद्धयः चण्डपण्ड—ट.

[9] खल्वाटसनक्तदेशसंकीर्ण—घ ; खल्वाटनक्तंचराः दश संकीर्णाः—ङ. न. झ ; खल्वाटसनर्तानृशंससंकीर्ण—ख ; खल्वाटचक्राङ्गसंकीर्णाः—मु. पा.

[10] क्रूरकर्माणः—ख. ङ. ञ. ट. मु. पा,

[11] क्रमतश्चान्याश्चो—ख ; क्रमतश्चान्ताश्चो—ञ ; क्रमश—मु. पा.

[12] धर्मधारणादिति—छ.

[13] प्रथमः खण्डः—ख ; विंशतिः खण्डः—all other MSS.

REVIEWS

Bharatiya Vidya (Vol. V), Miscellany, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1945. Price Rs. 4.

This is another commemoration volume in honour of Babu Shri Bahadur Singhji Singhi, edited by Dr. A. D. Pusalkar. This contains articles in English. There is a short account of Shri Singhji Singhi written in English by Sri Vijaya Muni. There are fifteen papers. The first is about some important principles and postulates in ancient Indian educational system by Dr. A. S. Altekar. This is followed by a Paper on Vālmīki, the Literary Critic. Some problems of Moghul History by Principal Shri Ram Sharma, The City of Bengala by Dr. Dinesh Chandra Sircar and Some Aspects of the Administration of Candragupta Maurya by Prof. V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar come after this. The next is on the pronounciations of *t* as *l* by Prof. K. Rama Pisharoti, which is a sort of paper about which scholars can only keep dignified silence as the most effective reply. The Vedic Sacrifice and Temple Worship by Acharya T. A. Venkateswara Dikshitar, European Pioneer Studies in South Indian Languages, Studies in the Regional History of Indian Paper Industry by Prof. P. K. Gode, The Gupta Era by Shri Dhirendra Nath Mukerjee and Veśyā by Dr. L. Sternbach are all papers of high scholarly value. There is a supplement of three articles: Veśyā by Dr. L. Sternbach (this is another part of a long and carefully brought out collection of facts), Jainism and Meat-eating by Shri M. V. Shah and A New Grant of Paramāra King Bhojadeva from Modasa by Prof. Hariprasad Shastri. The fifth and sixth Acts of the rare and valuable drama

Vīṇāvāsavadatta form the last contribution in this collection. Scholars can pay their homage to such a great patron of learning as Shri Bahadur Singhji Singhi only through such contribution which will last for ever. It is a rare privilege for any scholar to be associated with such a volume as a contributor.

EDITOR

Candralekhāsaṭṭaka of Rudradāsa, edited by Dr. A.N. Upadhye, 1945. Price Rs. 6-0-0.

This is the sixth number in the Bharatiya Vidya Series, Bombay. The work now edited is one of the most important publications in the field of Prakrit literature and also in the field of Indian Drama. *Saṭṭaka* is a particular kind of Prakrit drama of which Rājaśekhara's *Karpūramañjarī* was the only example till now known. Even among Prakrit works from sources other than Jain literature, many examples have not come to light. Dr. Upadhye's contribution to this field is already known to scholars through his earlier publications.

There is a very detailed Introduction in which the editor examines the material that he had at his disposal for this edition and then he enters into a consideration of the work and the type of drama called *Saṭṭaka* represented by it. A brief account of the drama is given noting the dramatis personae, the story of the drama and an analysis of the plot. After this there is a critical study of *Saṭṭaka*, tracing early Indian dramas, reviewing *Rūpakas* and *Uparūpakas*, describing the difference between *Nāṭikās* and *Saṭṭakas*, surveying the Prakrit dramas and estimating the position of *Saṭṭakas* in the evolution of dramas. There is a notice of the *Saṭṭakas* known so far, namely, *Karpūramañjari*, *Rambhāmañjari* of Nayacandra, *Vilāsavatī* of Mārkaṇḍeya, *Sṛṅgāramañjarī* of Viśveśvara and *Ānandasundarī* of Ghanaśyāma. This is followed by a comparative study of *Karpūramañjarī* and *Candralekhā* and a literary estimate of the *Saṭṭaka*. The editor then examines the

Prakrit of the *Saṭṭaka* now presented and also the metres used in the drama. This is followed by a short account of the author Rudradāsa. He was a Malabar poet in the court of the king of Calicut, the Zamorin Mānaveda.

The text of the drama in Prakrit is given on the top, and the variants in reading are given below it. Still below this is given the Sanskrit *Chāyā* for the text. There are four Acts in the drama. There is added an index of the stanzas, detailed notes on the text, an appendix giving the remarks and extracts on *Saṭṭaka* and *Nāṭikā*, a list of words and a short list of corrections.

So far as critical presentation is concerned, there is nothing to be desired. The entire material is given with an eye to accuracy in details and with a thoroughness in grasp. The Introduction deals with all the points that arise in connection with the work and the treatment of the subject is scholarly and illuminating.

In this, as in the Prakrit works hailing from Malabar, there is preserved a sort of language which is artificially constructed from Sanskrit according to the rules found in Vararuci's *Prākṛtaprakāṣa*. To the author and to the other poets who have written works in Prakrit, there is no real language called Prakrit. It is only Sanskrit transformed in a certain regular way. Thus all the Sanskrit words can be transformed into Prakrit. Prakrit language is only Sanskrit language with changes made in phonology and in morphology according to regular rules. Such an artificial specimen has its great value in studying a language, in so far as it preserves a certain pattern without being influenced by the causes that usually bring about variations in a progressing language. The language used here is not any particular variety of Prakrit; it is not the Prakrit of any particular age in the evolution of the language. It is just Prakrit according to Vararuci's grammar.

The Prakrit preserved in such original Prakrit works as those in Malabar and in the Malabar manuscripts of Sanskrit dramas and of the Prakrit poems of authors outside Malabar like Hāla and Rājaśekhara has a great value in studying a certain early stage of Prakrit. The Prakrit of the so-called Bhāsa dramas has been the subject of

much controversy among scholars. At present when so much of Malabar Prakrit has come to light, there is scope for a complete re-examination of the whole of the Bhāsa problem in the light of the Malabar Prakrits. Thus the edition has a topical interest too.

EDITOR

Nibhandhasaṅgraha, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1945. Price Rs. 5.

This is a commemoration volume (Smṛtigrantha) in honour of Babu Shri Bahadur Singhji Singhi, who passed away in 1944 at the early age of fifty-nine. It was through his munificent gift that the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan has been able to bring out a large number of Jain works. This commemoration volume was issued on the 7th of July 1945, which was the first anniversary of his death. This is a collection of studies in Hindi and Gujarati written by various scholars. There are, on the whole, 28 Papers collected in this volume. The volume opens with a long account of the life of the late Singhji covering 120 pages and profusely illustrated with photographs of various events in his life. There is also a facsimile reproduction of a letter of his addressed to Sri Jina Vijaya Muni, the editor of the Jain Series of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan. All the papers contributed to the volume are of great research value. It is not possible to draw attention to all the Papers in such a short review. The first article is by Rahul Sankrityayana on Prajñākara Gupta and his Bhāṣya. There are many contributions by the editor, some of them being very small, yet valuable notes. Among them are a collection of old verses relating to love, a paper on the definite date of Jinabhadra-Gaṇi, the Bhāṣyakāra, an unpublished copper plate of the Cālukya king Bhīmadeva I in Samvat 1120 and a rock inscription of the same in Samvat 1087, Jivadayārasa by the poet Asigaṇa, some old verses relating to joy in the Bhāṣā, *Sṛṅgāras'ata*, (which is an old Gujarati poem dealing with love), the first verse in the *Bṛhatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya etc. The volume closes with some recollections of Singhji by Sukhalalji

Sanghavi. The volume is a very useful collection of papers which keep up a high standard of scholarship.

EDITOR

Riṣṭasamuccaya of Durgadevācārya, edited by A. S. Gopani, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1945. Price Rs. 7-8-0.

This is number 21 in the Singhi Jain Series. Some works in this Series have already been noticed in these columns. The series owes its origin and maintenance to the munificence of the late Babu Shri Bahadur Singhi Singhji who was a liberal patron of letters and a Jain, and who has given commendable patronage to the publication of Jain works by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.

Riṣṭasamuccaya is a Prakrit metrical work dealing with omens that indicate approaching death. They are divided under three headings, *Piṇḍastha*, *Padastha* and *Rūpastha*. Under the first category come omens like cracking of fingers, motionlessness of the eyes, loss of sense of taste etc. Under the second category come experiences like seeing the sun and the moon in various forms, feeling a burning lamp as cold etc. The third category includes seeing shadows etc.

The text is edited with great care. The Introduction is exhaustive and critical. There is a translation of the text in English after the text portion. Then there are various indices that would be of great use in studying the text.

In these days of scientific rationalism such works may be ignored as superstition. But there are things beyond the cognizance of science. What are now thrown away as past superstitions may one day become living truths. At present it may serve only as an antiquarian curiosity. But soon it may give some guidance in arriving at truths not visioned by science.

EDITOR

Sandes'arāsaka of Abdul Rahman, edited by Shri Jina Vijaya Muni and Harivallabha Bhayani, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1945. Price Rs. 7-8-0

This is number 22 in the Singhi Jain Series. The name of the author is enough to warrant its great importance. As the name shows, the author is a Mulsim. The poem is in *Apabhraṁs'a* language; the author lived about the beginning of the thirteenth century, so far as could be ascertained by the editor.

Rāsa is a particular kind of metre. It is dealt with in works on metre relating to *Apabhraṁs'a*. There is a very detailed introduction from the pen of the co-editor Prof. Bhayani in which he deals with the Grammar and the Metre in the work. The summary of the poem is also given at the end of the Introduction.

The text is given on the top and below are given variants in the readings. Still below is given the commentary of Lakṣmidhara in Sanskrit (written in 1409 A.D.) The text portion is followed by a list of the verses and a list of words in the text. There are a few more lists that are of great use.

As the name shows, it is a *Sandes'akāvya*. But it is not an imitation of Kālidāsa's *Meghasandes'a*. The text is divided into three sections. The first section is introductory. There are long prayers in the beginning and then the name of the author is given as Abdul Rahman, the son of a weaver, who is famous for his Prakrit poems and songs. Then there is an apology for writing such a poem when great poems by ancient poets are available. Says he: "Though the moon shines at night, are not lamps lit in the houses on that account? Because the cuckoos sing on the tree-top with charm and appeal, should the crow on the house-roofs give up their cawings? If we heard sweet lute played upon by delicate fingers, should that be any bar to our hearing the drums and tabors at female-sports?" In this strain goes the poem through many stanzas, giving full play to the poet's fancy. Then there is an appeal for understanding on the part of the readers; and here ends the first part.

The story is that of a lady in Vijayanagara whose husband had left her long ago and whom she was longingly waiting for. She saw a traveller passing by and stopped him. The traveller stopped and seeing that charming lady, he recited a few *Gāthās* praising her beauty. Asked where he was going, the traveller gave a fine description of a city called Sambapura. He mentions the recitation of the tales of Sudayavatsa (Udayana Vatsa ?) and of Nala and the *Bhārata* stories; he refers to Brahmins uttering benedictions; there is mention of *Rāmāyaṇa*; in some places in the city *Vedas* are expounded; many other things are described. The description is a very long one covering more than twenty stanzas. The traveller was going from that city on an errand from his master, to a city called Stambhatirtha. Then she gives a message to her husband who too had gone to that same city. The message is contained in the following *Gāthā*, "My limbs shattered by the strokes of your separation do not fall asunder, because, my lord, they subsist on the hope of meeting you today or tomorrow." Then there are five more *Gāthās* as a message to the husband. Then there is a long conversation between the heroine and the traveller in which the heroine further elaborates on her sorrow during the separation. After this there is a long description of the six seasons. The description of the seasons is the third part. The heroine describes here her experiences during the various seasons in her separation. The traveller promises to convey the message to her husband. Then her husband returns and there is happy ending in this way, "As her great purpose was accomplished unexpectedly, so be it for those who recite or listen to this poem. Victory to him who is without beginning, without end."

How original and yet how classical is the whole treatment of the subject! And this poem is written by a Muslim. A poet's heart is not limited by race and religion. Man and his feelings, beauty and its attraction for those who can see beauty—these transcend all limitations of time and space and social conditions. The poet saw nothing foreign to him in this theme and we see nothing foreign in the poem, though the religion and social

environment of the poet on one side and the theme on the other side are supposed to lie in different regions. Nothing can contribute to cultural unity among men more effectively than such literary specimens.

EDITOR

Mudrārākṣasanāṭakakathā of Mahādeva, edited by Dr. V. Raghavan, 1946. Price Rs. 2-8-0.

This is the first number of a series started by the Saraswati Mahal Library, Tanjore, which belonged to the former Rajas of Tanjore. The editor in his Introduction notices the importance of the work and also other works of a similar nature. There is an account of the author and a discussion on his date. Ravinartaka's *Cāṇakya Kathā* has already been published from Calcutta. The editor shows that this work is the basis for the metrical version of Ravinartaka. There is also a Malayalam metrical version of Ravinarthaka very well known in Malabar. Two more different versions of the story have already been published from Bikaner in the Ganga Oriental Series (they were reviewed in these columns in the last issue). The editor has made a critical analysis of all this material.

The text is printed with great care and the notes that follow are very useful. The further notes on the names in the story which follow have been prepared after very exhaustive examination of all the material available. There is an index of verses taken from the drama and introduced into this prose version and also a concordance of prose passages from the drama found in this version. It is a very welcome addition to the prose literature in Sanskrit and it will be a useful aid for students in studying the *Mudrārākṣasa* drama; it can also serve as a suitable text book in the college classes for beginners.

EDITOR

Kauṭalīya with a Malayalam commentary edited by Prof. V. A. Ramaswami Sastri, 1945. Price Re. 1.

This is number 67 in the Malayalam Series of the University of Travancore. This is an old commentary in Malayalam on the *Arthas'āstra* of Kauṭalya. Two parts of this had already appeared. This part, which is the third, contains the commentary for the third Book. The commentary is very lucid and is of great help in determining the text of the *Arthas'āstra* and also the meaning of the passages. Since it is a fairly old one, it has a linguistic importance also, presenting a specimen of Malayalam prose some centuries ago. The effort even in those ancient times to bring to the notice of the people of the country the literature contained in Sanskrit language is another important feature of the work; the language had started on its course of development even at that early time, on the intellectual side also besides on its literary side. The late Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri had written a commentary on the *Arthas'āstra;* he had taken much of the material from this Malayalam commentary. The commentary is available only in fragment. It is hoped that the remaining portion that is available will soon find the light of day.

EDITOR

Grammar of Līlātilaka by Prof. L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar, Saraswati Printing and Publishing House, Trichur, 1944. Price Rs. 7-8-0.

The name of Prof. L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar has become well-known to students of philology through his many valuable contributions on Malayalam philology. I can mention a large number of such contributions that have appeared in various journals. The following are a few among them. A Modern Malayalam Tense-form with ēṉē (*Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society*); Our Language: A Causerie; A South Indian Evaluation of Sanskrit (*Indian Historical Quarterly*); Linguistic preservations in Malayalam (*Journal of Oriental Research*; Madras); A Primer of

Malayalam Phonology ; Līlātilakam and Tamil Grammatical Works. The present book is a small treatise on the Grammar of Malayalam as studied from a book named *Līlātilakam* treating of the '*Maṇipravāḷam* style of Malayalam. There is no doubt that Malayalam belongs to the Dravidian Family of Languages. It came into contact with Sanskrit and absorbed much of its vocabulary and also the ideas contained in Sanskrit literature. The literary forms in Sanskrit and the metres in Sanskrit also found their way into Malayalam. In the course of this admixture there developed a very interesting language form called *Maṇipravāḷam* (pearl-ruby). It is a style of literary composition in which Malayalam words are used along with Sanskrit words in such a way that they combine into a very artistic form of poetic expression. I give an example below. I put the Malayalam words in italics and give the Sanskrit translation in brackets, so that readers can easily follow the passage. It is taken from a work called *Candrotsavam*.

madhurakavitayā ye kautukaṃ kovidānām
dhvanimukharamukhānām kurvate garvahināḥ |
avar (te) *palarum* (sarve) amuṣmin navyabhāṣāprabandhe
tuṇa (dayām) *peṭuk*-(āvahantu) abhirāme medinīcandrikāyāḥ ||

Here it will be noticed that there are only four Malayalam words. This style was once very prominent in Malayalam literature and continued even till recent times.

Līlātilakam deals with the language of this form of literature. The work deals with grammar and *Alaṅkāras*. Here Prof. Ramaswami Aiyar analyses the grammar portion and also the examples cited in the work from earlier or comtemporary literature.

It is presumed that Malayalam developed as a separate language from Tamil only about six hundred years ago. Much work has yet to be done on this point. The social contact of Malayalis has been more intimate with the people from the Kannada area in the north than with the people of the Tamil area on the east; even now the Tamil immigrants into Malabar have not been able

to get merged in the Malayalam Society; but people from the north have been coming to the country and settling down there for many centuries and they all gradually got merged into the society of the country. The Brahmins from the Kannada regions in the north are allowed to perform divine service as priests in Malabar temples; but the Brahmins from the east are not allowed to do so. Does this social intimacy indicate an early linguistic intimacy also? Is the Tamilism found in Malayalam radical and integral or only external and casual? These points have yet to be examined scientifically. The material collected by Prof. Ramaswami Aiyar and the conclusions arrived at by him on a variety of points will be of great help for a comprehensive examination of the whole problem. The present book is one of the notable contributions to Malayalam philology. It is unfortunate that, for want of proper types, Malayalam had to be printed in Malayalam script; this may be a handicap to many a reader.

EDITOR

Critical Word Index to the Bhagavadgītā by Rao Bahadur P. C. Divanji, New Book Co. Ltd., Bombay, 1946. Price Rs. 12.

This is one of the books the like of which is very much needed in India for the critical study of a text. The compiler is a close student of Hindu religion and philosophy and a critical scholar in the texts dealing with Hindu religion and philosophy. Having regard to the nature of the Sanskrit language, a mere word index of a text is of little assistance; in Sanskrit most of the words are really sentences. So it is necessary to split up these so-called full words into their component parts which alone are really *words*. In the case of the *Bhagavadgītā*, the position is still further complicated by the presence of more than one recension with considerable variations between them. The compiler has applied his powers of analysis and of judicious selection in preparing this index of such a complicated text.

He has taken the full grammatical words (which in most cases are sentences containing two or more word-units) and given as Part I, an Index of them in two main sections, one for the ordinary text known to and interpreted by the Ācāryas and the other for the Kashmerian recension which has considerable variations from this normal text, including in this latter only those words that are not already included in the first list. Thus he has 3865 words in the first group and 426 in the second. Even in this latter, the bare word may have occurred in the first list, but the particular place where the word occurs may not be found in the normal text. Thus even in this second list there are two divisions : those that occur in the first list but which occur in passages in the Kashmerian text that are not found in the normal text, and those that do not find a place at all in the normal text. Such latter words are again given in a separate list as C. This is followed by a concordance of variants in the different editions and commentaries of the normal text. There is a similar concordance for the Kashmerian recension also, as compared with the normal text.

This process is repeated in the Part II for the parts of the words already listed in the first part. Even when a compound word is once analysed, the two parts may not be final words : one or both may still be compounds of still smaller word-units. He repeats the process until he reaches the last and final components of the words. Thus he gets secondary, tertiary and quarternary word-units. He gives these units both for the normal text and also for the Kashmerian text on the same plan as in the first part. Then there is given a list of word-units that are common to all or to two of the above three divisions included in this part (secondary etc.). Here also the differentiation of the normal and the Kashmerian texts is kept up.

In the end is given as Part III a consolidated index of all the words given in the above two parts, primary in part I and secondary etc. in Part II, with the two sections for the normal text and the Kashmerian text.

This analysis will show what amout of labour the compiler has undertaken on himself to finish the work. The words and the parts of words in the *Bhagavadgītā*, the grammar of the words in the text of the *Bhagavadgītā*, the meanings of the words in the *Bhagavadgītā*, the variants in the readings and a host of other details are brought together in this volume. There is nothing here which is not in the *Bhagavadgītā* and there is nothing in the *Bhagavadgītā* which is not here.

There is a scholarly introduction where the plan of the work is given and explained. The problem of text variations, especially with reference to the Kashmerian text, is fully discussed. Here we find the judicial mind of the author. He is definite in his opinion; but he does not go beyond what are warranted by facts and what are strictly relevent to the question at issue.

All research scholars are indebted to Mr. Divanji for this great undertaking. All students of the *Bhagavadgītā* must own a copy of this work, if they desire to understand the *Gītā* critically.

EDITOR

OBITUARY NOTICES

Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, the retired Director-General of Archaeology in India passed away at Poona on the 12th of August 1946 after three months of illness. He was intimately associated with the excavations in Mahenjo Daro and other places, when he was in service. A detailed account will appear in the next issue of this *Bulletin*.

Dr. Hirananda Sastri, the retired Epigraphist of the Government of India passed away in August 1946. After his retirement from the service of the Government of India, he was Director of Archaeology in Baroda and he has published many reports of that State. He was a great Sanskrit Scholar.

PRESENTATION VOLUME TO OUR EDITOR

THE friends, colleagues and old students of Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, our editor, had arranged to present him with a Volume of Studies in appreciation of his contribution to scholarship in various directions. The volume should have been got ready one year ago according to the original plan. But owing to the large number of papers that came in from various scholars and owing to the difficulties experienced now in the matter of printing books, the publication took one more year. The volume is now ready and is being issued. There are contributions in it from scholars in India, Ceylon, England, France and America. It is a substantial volume of nearly six hundred pages and has been very neatly printed by the Vasanta Press, Theosophical Society, Adyar. Dr. Raja has done full justice to the opportunities which he had, and it is to be hoped that he will have still greater opportunities for rendering service to scholarship. The volume will be a fitting tribute to what he has done to scholars and what scholars can do to him.

DIRECTOR,

Adyar Library

Printed and Published by C. Subbarayudu, at the Vasanta Press, The Theosophical Society, Adyar, Madras—P. I. C. No. 85—21-9-1946



GEORGE S. ARUNDALE

(1-12-1878—11-8-1945)

President of the Theosophical Society.

June 21, 1934—August 11, 1945



C. JINARĀJADĀSA

(Born. 16-12-1875—)

President of the Theosophical Society.

Assumed charge on 17-2-1946

SCHOLARSHIP AND ANTIQUARIANISM

By C. Jinarājadāsa

A THIN line divides the scholar from the antiquarian. Perhaps outside of Europe and the United States, antiquarianism will not be understood in its full significance. It is difficult to define the antiquarian; he is as a hanger-on to the true scholar who must not depart from certain accepted standards of scholarship and criticism. The true scholar is a creator; he shapes the past to give a message to the present. The antiquarian takes up the dead bones of literature and the arts, revels in collecting them, and misses largely the inner spirit which makes literature and the arts live. He is by his nature insensitive to the subtle measure or *tanmātra* of things; he has erected a barrier round him of special interests, and is above all a *collector*, not a student.

Yet a scholar must also be a collector; he needs for his works masses of facts. They need to be filed and indexed, if not on paper, at least in his mind. Dealing so much as he does with words, he must be a lexicographer, to the extent that he knows roots and what are their brothers or cousins in other languages. The tangled masses of facts must be accepted by the scholar as his "material;" if he kneads the material with the leaven of his thought, he makes living substance of the material; if he does not, or cannot, he is the antiquarian, whom Carlyle once described as, "sitting on a dung heap surrounded by an innumerable heap of dead dogs."

The story is told of a German professor who read Cicero through every year for 50 years, for the sake of settling some grammatical question, the result being the discovery that *necesse est* may be used with the accusative and infinitive or *ut* with subjunctive, but *necesse erat* only with *ut* and

subjunctive. And he thought to make that discovery well worth living and working for 50 years. This is the true antiquarian. Of another type is the antiquarian whom the poet Cowper held up to ridicule:

> Learned philologists who chase
> A panting syllable through time and space,
> Start it at home, and hunt it in the dark
> To Gaul, to Greece, and into Noah's ark.

We have in old Sanskrit texts any number of these dead bones passing as "knowledge." Fantastic derivations are accepted as "gospel truth" generation after generation without any challenge. One egregious pun is in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*. At the sacrifice by which the Devas go to Svarga, Ṛṣis and men are obstructed by the sacrificial post (*yūpa*) from obtaining the privilege.

> *taṁ vai yūpenaivāyopayans, taṁ yad yūpenaivāyopayans tad yūpasya yūpatvam.* (II. 1)

The root *yūp* from which is derived the name for sacrificial post, is assimilated to the root *yup* which means to hinder. It is not dissimilar to the puns of Hood, such as we have in the first verse of seventeen, every one of them with a pun, describing Faithless Nellie Gray:

> Ben Battle was a soldier bold,
> And used to war's alarms:
> But a cannon-ball took off his legs,
> So he laid down his arms.

Perhaps the cleverest pun of Hood's is that where the death is announced:

> He went and told the sexton,
> And the sexton tolled the bell.

Kālidāsa in *Raghuvaṁśa* is full of puns, and he takes a delight in showing his cleverness. But unconscious and

unhumorous, though ludicrous to modern scholarship, are the many false etymologies in Sāyaṇa's commentary on the *Ṛgveda*. They are akin to the equation *ostler*, (the stableman in the old days of coaching travel)=oat-stealer. A children's joke is the explanation of why Alexander was called the Great; the king was constantly demanding roast eggs at the camp dining-room, and if they were not instantly ready some cook's head had to come off at once. So a sentinel was kept to be on the look out, and the instant Alexander was seen in the distance coming, the order went forth, "All eggs under the grate!" As time passes, false etymologies are surrounded with sanctity, and no one dare challenge them since "the memory of man runneth not to the contrary."

A type of antiquarianism is this hit about Homeric scholarship, on which probably there are thousands of works, especially among the Germans:

Poluphloisboisterous Homer of old
    Threw all his augments into the sea;
Although he had often been courteously told
    That perfect imperfects begin with an *e*;
But the Poet replied with a dignified air,
    "What the Digamma[1] does anyone care?"

One has to know the rolling wave-like verses of Homer, like the surf that comes crashing on to the beach one wave after another to understand his "poluphloisboisterousness." They say, "Homer nods," not only about incidents already narrated; but it is the poet's breaking the strict rules of grammar which brings the retort from Homer, "What the digamma does anyone care?"

[1] A character meaning "two gammas" or two "g", which once existed in the Greek alphabet. Its appearance was similar to F, except that it sloped more to the right, the second cross stroke was shorter, and the foot longer. Its sound was either "f" or "v". Greek *ois*, for *ovis*, Latin, *ovum*; Greek *idein* for *videin*; Latin, *videre*, etc.

The scholar must be up to his neck with antiquarian facts but he must not be drowned by them ; his task is to be ready as he creates to say about ancient traditions, " What the digamma does any one care ? " It is this scholar's independence of the past, though not scorning it as valueless, which makes scholarship alive. An essay of Colebrook's is still readable ; for the zest in the beginnings of Sanskrit scholarship was not antiquarian. As the poet creates immortal things for the many, the scholar creates equally immortal things though for the few. But he must distinguish in himself how much he is the antiquarian, the collector of dead bones, and how much the scholar who passes on to succeeding generations the torch he has received from his Gurus.

THE SPLENDOUR OF INDIAN CULTURE[1]

BY GEORGE S. ARUNDALE

TO speak of Indian culture is to speak of Indian character, for essentially there is no difference between culture and character any more than there is any essential difference between religion and politics or between science and art, however much mankind may make the differences. There is but One Life, even though we divide it up into different compartments according to our limited understanding both of life and of life's purpose ; and the more we are able to discover the one amidst the many the more will there be culture and therefore character, and the more will there be peace and harmony throughout the world. At present the life of the whole world, of every faith and nation in the world, is as a house divided against itself, with the inevitable result of conflict, disorder and violence.

[1] With acknowledgments to the Editor of *The Theosophist*.

The Very Heart of Life

I think we should all the better understand culture were we to identify it with character, were we to realize that culture is not a virtue by itself, apart from all other virtues, but the very heart of evolving life, and there is nothing outside culture just as in truth there is nothing outside art or science or any other facet of the diamond of life. We may well define culture as the outward and visible sign of the growth of the evolutionary process, of that process of the unfoldment of life which we perceive to be expressed ladder-like from life unconscious in the lowest forms of life to Life Divine as we see it in the Saviours, the Saints and Rishis of the world. The less the culture, the more limited the unfoldment. The greater the culture, the greater the unfoldment. The less the culture, the less the character. The greater the culture, the nobler the character.

The savage is certainly not cultured. I wonder if we dare call the civilized man cultured, especially if we look upon our so-called civilization as it is manifested in the war-stricken world of today. Still, in civilization there is more culture than in savagery. And still more true is it that in the heights of civilization, as in the truly great, in the saintly, in the heroic, in those who have genius, culture and therefore character is still more unfolded.

And in the Gods culture-character reaches its Everestian heights. But even in the savage there are the seeds of culture, only awaiting time for unfoldment into bud and into their apotheosis of flower. Culture does not begin at a certain point, any more than character. It knows neither beginning nor end.

I would add that culture is one in its nature even though it may have many forms. There may be many cultures shining forth from one culture, as there may be many colours shining forth from the one white light. A man or

woman of culture anywhere, no matter what the hue of his culture, is a man or a woman of culture everywhere. Culture knows no distinction of race, or nationality, or creed, or caste, or colour, even though there may be innumerable differences of culture as race, or nation, or creed, or caste differs from another. Indeed, one of the great causes of the present discontent lies in our inability to recognize the unity of culture amidst the many different cultures, the unity of character amidst the many differences of character. Each race and nation and faith and caste has, of course, its own culture; but the pity of it is that each culture-community deems its own culture superior to all other cultures, and does not for a moment recognize the fact that each culture has its own unique splendour and must be assimilated ere true culture can be won. There is a jingoism in culture as there is a jingoism in patriotism, and I very much fear most people, though fortunately in diminishing numbers, are jingoes so far as their respective cultures are concerned. They would even like to see their own particular brand of culture dominate the whole world, at whatever cost to all other cultures.

The Roots of Culture

If I am asked to be more precise in defining culture I can only say that it is universally composed of three fundamental features or characteristics—first Reverence, second Comradeship, third Compasssion: and for the simple reason that these are of the essence of all unfolding life. These three qualities are of the essence of all cultures everywhere, of Indian culture no less than of all other cultures. Without them there is no culture. To the degree to which they are in manifestation, to that degree is there culture.

People sometimes think that culture depends upon ability to discriminate between a good picture and a bad

picture, between good music and bad music, between what is artistic and what is inartistic. And they think that good manners mean culture, while bad manners mean lack of it. In other words, they are inclined to conventionalize culture so that those may be regarded as having it who appreciate and condemn as the prevailing conventions demand, and who live in their daily lives and in their contacts with their fellows also as the prevailing conventions demand. Thus does culture become a veneer instead of being life, a desert of illusion instead of an oasis of reality.

It is also often thought that true culture is only to be found in so-called centres of art or science or philosophy, in which the self-proclaimed devotees of their respective forms of culture follow their respective pathways in preening self-satisfaction. Shall I not say that every single individual is a centre of culture, be the actual expression of his culture but a trickling stream or perchance a mighty torrent? I insist that culture is as much to be found in the village, in every village home, as in any town or city, as in the most ornate palace adorned with priceless treasures bearing the hallmark of cultural respectability.

The Splendid Culture of India

And as for Indian culture, I will say that it is to be found far more in the Indian village, in the simple and humble village home, than in any town or city throughout the land. I have said that in my opinion Reverence, Comradeship, Compassion are the three pillars of culture. After nearly forty years of living in India, and of much contact with the very workers themselves, I do not hesitate to say that these three great virtues are inherent in Indian culture, and are at the root of all Indian art and of what is called Indian culture generally. Submerged though it be under foreign influences,

Reverence yet remains the heart of Indian culture, and is the fragrance of Indian life. Where is there a comradeship more unrestricted, more understanding than the comradeship so wonderfully expressed in Indian relationships when simply and naturally forthflowing ? And although the spirit of compassion may have become obscured in India as it shines so feebly, too, throughout the world, still it remains one of the mightiest peaks in the range of Indian culture, which every noblest Indian has ascended, as, for example, the Lord Buddha Himself, and from which each has proclaimed compassion as one of the highest purposes of life.

All the splendid culture of India as displayed in her arts and crafts, in her sciences, in the veriest details of her daily life, have blossomed forth from Reverence, Goodwill and Compassion, enriched as these have been by civilization after civilization, by faith after faith, as these have entered her land. And those are indeed face to face with India's culture who perceive that that art is true, those crafts are true, those sciences faithfully depict the Laws of God, those details of daily life are Indian, which display one or another of these virtue-fragrances in all that they are.

I have sought in this talk to lay stress on what I regard as the supreme fundamentals of culture everywhere, and as in special purity manifest in what is really Indian culture. For only as we start from the foundations shall we be able to estimate the worth of the superstructure, and only as we recognize the nature of the foundations shall we be able to encourage that culture without which all other living is of so little avail.

VANAMĀLI MIS'RA, A PUPIL OF BHAṬṬOJI DĪKṢITA AND HIS WORKS—BETWEEN A.D. 1600 AND 1660

By P. K. Gode

According to Aufrecht[1] Bhaṭṭoji had a pupil of the name कृष्णदत्तमिश्र called also वनमालिमिश्र. He was the son of महेशमिश्र and composed a work called the कुरुक्षेत्रप्रदीप. Vanamāli Mis'ra also composed a work called संध्यामन्त्रव्याख्या ब्रह्मप्रकाशिका,[2] a MS. of which has been described by Stein.[3] It begins as follows:

"महेश्वरं नमस्कृत्य वनमाली महेशजः ।
करोति संध्यामंत्राणां व्याख्यां ब्रह्मप्रकाशिकां ॥"

[1] *CC, I, 120*—"कृष्णदत्तमिश्र called also वनमालिमिश्र son of महेशमिश्र, pupil of Bhaṭṭoji: कुरुक्षेत्रप्रदीप L. 2257." MS. L. 2257 is described by R. Mitra in his *Notices*, VII, 1884, pp. 12-14. It ends:—"इति श्रीकुरुक्षेत्रनिवासमहेशमिश्रपुत्रेण श्रीभट्टोजिदीक्षितशिष्येण श्रीमद्वनमालिमिश्रेण संरचित: कुरुक्षेत्रप्रदीप: समाप्त: संवत् १९२५" (=A.D. **1869**), This is a guide to the sacred places in Kurukṣetra.

[2] *CC, II, 130*—"वनमालिमिश्र son of महेश, pupil of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita: संध्यामन्त्रव्याख्या ब्रह्मप्रकाशिका"

CC, III, 117—Do.

CC, III, 144—"संध्यामंत्रव्याख्या ब्रह्मप्रकाशिका by वनमालिमिश्र son of महेश IL."

[3] *Catalogue of Jammu MSS.*, 1894, p. 21 (MS. No. 5210).

It ends :

" भट्टोजिदीक्षितं नत्वा कृत्वा ब्रह्मप्रकाशिका ।
व्याख्येयं संध्यामंत्राणां मिश्रेण वनमालिना ॥
वेदार्थज्ञाने न शक्ता विप्रा वेदार्थवादिना ।
मध्याख्येयं समालोक्य दृढता क्षम्यता मम ॥

इति श्रीभट्टोजिदीक्षितशिष्यकुरुक्षेत्रनिवासिमहेशमिश्रात्मजवनमालिमिश्र-विरचितायां संध्यामंत्रव्याख्या ब्रह्मप्रकाशिका समाप्ता "

Koṇḍabhaṭṭa, the nephew of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita composed a work called वैयाकरणभूषण. One वनमालिमिश्र composed a commentary on this work called "वैयाकरणमतोन्मज्जना"[1] and another work called "सिद्धान्ततत्वविवेक."[2] As the MSS. of these works are not accessible to me, I am unable to say if this वनमालिमिश्र, the commentator of a work of Bhaṭṭoji's nephew, is identical with his namesake, the pupil of Bhaṭṭoji himself. H. P. Shastri,[3] however, states that Vanamālı, the author of the वैयाकरणमतो-न्मज्जनटीका was a pupil of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita himself.

[1] *CC, I, 614*—" वैयाकरणभूषणमतोन्मज्जिनी by Vanamāli Mis'ra, L. 1789. N. P. VII, 68."

CC, II, 146—" Stein 46."

[2] *CC, I, 719*—" सिद्धान्ततत्वविवेक " On Syntax by Vanamāli Mis'ra, Lahore 6."

[3] Vide p. 13 of *Des. Cata. of Vyākaraṇa MSS.* (R. A. S. B.) Calcutta, Vol. VI, 1931—Bhaṭṭoji wrote 71 Kārikās after the completion of his शब्दकौस्तुभ. The MS. No. 4229 contains the first 35 Kārikās with commentary of Vanamāli who speaks of Bhaṭṭoji as his guru :—

" जगतः पितरौ नत्वा पार्व्वतीपरमेश्वरौ ।
गुरुभिर्यं कृताः श्लोकाष्टीका तेषां वितन्यते ॥

In my paper on the date of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita published in the *Journal* of the Tirupati Oriental Institute (Vol, I, Part 2, pages 117-127) I have fixed up Bhaṭṭoji's literary career between about A.D. 1560 and 1620. Subsequently I have published two papers, one on the Chronology of the Works of Varadarāja (*P. V. Kane Volume*, 1941, pages 188-199) and the other on the Chronology of the Works of Nīlakaṇṭha S'ukla (*New Indian Antiquary*, Vol. V, 1942, pages 177-183). Both these authors were pupils of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita like Vanamāli Mis'ra and composed works say between A.D. 1610 and 1660. We have reason to suppose that Vanamāli Mis'ra, their contemporary and co-student studying at the feet of their common teacher Bhaṭṭoji, must have composed his works between about A.D. 1610 and 1660. This is a reasonable conclusion but it needs to be backed up by the evidence of contemporary MSS. of the works of Vanamāli Mis'ra. Such evidence was not so far available to me. Fortunately in Fascicule II of the *Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Anup Sanskrit Library* at Bikaner by Dr. C. K. Raja and Mr. K. M. K. Sarma (1946) I have found such evidence. It is as follows:

(1) *Page 134*—MS. No. 5— कुरुक्षेत्रप्रदीप by कुरुक्षेत्रनिवासि वनमालिमिश्र, son of महेशमिश्र and pupil of भट्टोजि दीक्षित, dated *Saṁvat 1741* (=**A. D. 1684**).

This guru is no other than Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita because Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa in his वैयाकरणभूषणसार (Benares Edition) says:—

> " भट्टोजिदीक्षितैः श्रेष्ठैर्निर्मिताः कारिकाः शुभाः ।
> कौण्डभट्टेन व्याख्याताः कारिकास्ताः सुविस्तरम् ॥ "

These Kārikās number 71 of which 35 have been explained by Vanamāli in this MS.

(2) *Page 145*—MS. No. 25—कुरुक्षेत्रप्रदीप by the above author dated *Saṁvat 1709* (=**A. D. 1652**) copied by दत्तमिश्र.

It is clear from the above dated MSS. of the कुरुक्षेत्रप्रदीप that this work was composed by Vanamāli Mis'ra prior to **A. D. 1652**. Most probably this MS. was written during the life-time of Vanamāli. I cannot say if he was living up to *A. D. 1684*, when the other MS. of this work was copied.

(3) *Page 137*—MS. No. 61—सर्वतीर्थप्रकाश by the above Vanamāli Mis'ra (this MS. bears no date.)

(4) *Page 164*—MS. No. 19—दिव्यानुष्ठानपद्धति by नारायणभट्ट son of रामेश्वरभट्ट copied by वनमालिमिश्र in *Saṁvat 1678* (=**A. D. 1621**).

The Catalogue does not say if the copyist वनमालिमिश्र of the above MS. of *A. D. 1621* was pupil of Bhaṭṭoji. Most probably this वनमालिमिश्र is identical with his namesake, the author of कुरुक्षेत्रप्रदीप, सर्वतीर्थप्रकाश, संध्यामन्त्रव्याख्या ब्रह्मप्रकाशिका, and perhaps of वैय्याकरणमतोन्मज्जना and सिद्धान्ततत्वविवेक. If this identity is proved to be correct we can definitely say that this MS. of **A. D. 1621** is a specimen of the handwriting of one of the pupils of the great grammarian Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita.

As regards Aufrecht's statement that "कृष्णदत्तमिश्र" was another name of "वनमालिमिश्र" I have to say that it needs to be verified. In this connection I have to observe that the Bikaner MS. of his कुरुक्षेत्रप्रदीप dated **A. D. 1652** was copied by one "दत्तमिश्र" as stated in the Catalogue. It is possible to suppose that "दत्तमिश्र" is an abbreviated form of "कृष्णदत्त-मिश्र" but I cannot say if कृष्णदत्तमिश्र and वनमालिमिश्र are identical.

Possibly दत्तमिश्र, who copied in 1652 A.D. the MS. of the कुरुक्षेत्रप्रदीप of वनमालिमिश्र, was a different person, though he might have been a member of the family of वनमालिमिश्र.

A Madhva writer of the name वनमालिमिश्र of the भारद्वाजगोत्र and hailing from the neighbourhood of Vṛndāvana composed मारुतमण्डन[1] and other works between c. A.D. 1575 and 1650. On folio 57 of MS. *No. 718 of 1882-83* of मारुतमण्डन in the Govt. MSS. Library at the B. O. R. Institute he quotes from मनोरमा as follows:

"उक्तं हि **मनोरमायां** अश्वक इत्यत्राश्वशब्दः अश्वे वर्तते, कन्प्रत्ययस्तु प्रतिकृतिरूपे सदृशे इत्यर्कः। अन्ये तु गौर्वाहीक इतिवत् अश्वशब्दः" etc.

The "मनोरमा" mentioned in the above quotation may be the प्रौढमनोरमा of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita (A.D. 1560-1620). The identity of वनमालिमिश्र, the author of the मारुतमण्डन, with his namesake, the author of the कुरुक्षेत्रप्रदीप (MS. of A.D. 1652), needs to be examined on documentary evidence. I have only recorded here the foregoing points to enable other scholars to study this point further. Chronologically there would be no difficulty in identifying these two authors of the same name वनमालिमिश्र.

[1] See my paper on this work in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XXII, (1946).

KĀMAPRABODHA, KARṆATOṢA AND ṢADBHĀṢĀMAYAPATRA

By K. Madhava Krishna Sarma

Kāmaprabodha

Kāmaprabodha of Vyāsa Janārdana, composed under the patronage of Mahārājā Anupsingh is, as the title indicates, a work on erotics in Ten Prakaraṇas, containing about six hundred granthas. The Prakāśas are:

1. Strījātinirūpaṇa
2. Puruṣajātinirūpaṇa
3. Kanyādilakṣaṇaviveka
4. Aṅgarāgādiviveka
5. Stambhanādiviveka
6. Saṁkocanādiviveka
7. Vaśīkaraṇopāyaviveka
8. Nānābandhaviveka
9. Parirambhaṇavidhi
10. Keśaprakāra

The MS. of this is numbered 3927 in the Library. It contains 27 folios of which the first one and the last three are later restorations. The names of the author and the patron are mentioned at the beginning:

अथ कामप्रबोधः प्रारभ्यते ।

दुरितगणविरामं रावणध्वस्तकामं विजितपरशुरामं कल्पितानेकयामम् ।
फलितसकलकामं सर्बदैवाभिरामं नतजनकृतकामं नौमि रामं सवामम ॥
यः पुष्पबाणैरपि पञ्चसंख्यैर्जगत्त्रयं क्षोभयति क्षणेन ।
स सर्ववन्द्योऽद्भुतशक्तियुक्तः स्त्रीकोऽलिबन्धुर्जयति स्मरेशः ॥
समस्तविद्वज्जनतोषपोषकरस्य भावो गुणसंग्रही च ।
दूरीकृतानेकखलप्रचारो विद्यानिधिः सुन्दरसंनिवेशः ॥
संस्तूयमानः कविभिः सुधीरो दानैकशीलो नृपकर्णसूनुः ।
अनूपसिंहः क्षितिपालमौलिभूषामणिर्दीनदयापरो यः ॥
तदाज्ञया व्यासजनार्दनाख्यः कामप्रबोधं तनुतेऽतिविद्वान् ।
विलासिनां कामकलाप्रवीणस्त्रीभोगभाजामतिकौतुकाय ॥

End :

संवेष्टय सर्वाङ्गुलिभिः कचौघं सदा पतिं धारयति स्मरार्ता ।
भुजङ्गवल्ली परिकीर्तितेयं रतोत्सवे केशकलाविधिज्ञैः ॥ इति केशप्रकारः ॥

इति श्रीमन्महाराजाधिराजमहाराजानूपसिंहदेवीये कामप्रबोधे दशमः प्रकाशः ॥ समाप्तश्चायं ग्रन्थः ॥

Aufrecht in his *Catalogus Catalogorum* I, 93 notices this as the work of Anupsingh. This is not correct. The work noticed by Mitra in his *Catalogue*, p. 532, No. 1133, is different from this.

KARṆATOṢA OR KARṆAVILĀSA OF MUDGALA

The MS. of this is numbered 5622 in the Anup Sanskrit Library. There is a brief notice of this on p. 279 of Mitra's *Catalogue.* It was written by Mudgaladeva, a devotee of God Narasiṁha, under the patronage of Mahārājā Karansinghji of

Bikaner. This fact is not mentioned in Mitra's *Catalogue*. There is also no date of the work given there. The date is mentioned as Pārthivābda at the end. This corresponds to A.D. 1645. According to Mitra's *Catalogue* the MS. contained 41 folios. The MS. now contains only 36, foll. 1, 2, 4, 5 and 9 are missing. The beginning of the present MS. is as follows:

. . . . भिक्षुकाद्यर्थवन्त-
स्तांस्तन्देवद्रुमादीन्वितरणकलया ते परं वै हसन्तः ।
सोऽस्माकं दातु शक्तिर्विलसति सुतरां कर्णराजायमस्मिन्
किं तैर्नस्यात्तु कृत्यं पशुकठिनदृषद्रावयातैरपारैः ॥
बीकानेरिपतिर्यशोऽधिवसतिः प्राप्तप्रतापोन्नति-
र्विश्वालङ्कृतिरुज्वलामलमतिः पुण्यैकमूर्तेः स्थितिः ।
सौजन्यामृतवारिधिर्गुणनिधिर्भीमो महत्यां युधि
त्रस्ताहंमतिरुन्मतिर्विजयते श्रीकर्ण एषः प्रभुः ॥

मुरज बन्धः ।

सलक्ष्मीः कर्णगो यस्तु त्वलक्ष्मीः कर्णगो नयः ।
सुखधाम घनानन्दी सुखधाम घनात्परः ॥

Ends:

श्रीमत्पार्थिवसंज्ञिकाब्दविलसत्पुर्जे दशम्यां तिथौ
तत्सत्स्वम्बपुरीनिवासरतितद्योगेश्वरी पन्नतेः ।
श्रीमत्कर्णविलास एष विहितः सन्मुद्गलाख्येन स-
च्छन्दोभि र्नृहरेस्तु वर्णनमथो सत्कामिनी वर्णनम् ॥

इति श्रीकर्णतोषे मुद्गलदेवविरचिते सर्वेषां छन्दसां बन्धः ।

श्रीकृष्णार्पणमस्तु ।

सतां तच्चरणध्यानाद्विदुषां परमादरात् ।
कर्णस्य विलसद्बुद्धेः स्तोषकृत् ग्रन्थसङ्ग्रहः ।

On the last Page :

छन्दोग्रन्थ कर्णसंतोष मुद्गलकृत महाराज श्री कर्णसिंह जी कारित ॥

ṢAḌBHĀṢĀMAYAPATRA OF RŪPACANDRA

Saḍbhāṣāmayapatra is a small one-act drama in four varieties of Prākṛt and two varieties of Sanskrit by Rūpacandra. In the assembly of Gods, Sarasvatī, Sun, Moon and Guru describe to Indra the prowess of Mahārājā Sujansinghji. The varieties of Prākṛt employed are Prākṛt, S'auraseni, Māgadhī and Pais'ācī. The Sanskrit used is two-fold, Saṁskṛta and Samasaṁskṛta. By Samasaṁskṛta the author does not mean any difference in language, but only Sanskrit employed in metre common to both Sanskrit and Prākṛt; *viz.* the Āryā. There is reference to Ānandarāma, a minister of Mahārājā Sujansinghji, for whose amusement, the author says, he wrote this play. The MS. is numbered 3190 in the Anup Sanskrit Library. It contains some lacunae. At the end it is dated Saṁvat 1787 *i.e.*, A.D. 1730. According to a statement at the beginning, the drama was written in an As'rama on the bank of the river Venna.

Begins :

. . . . . सिद्धान्त तत्त्वबोधाभिधायिने ।
अस्तु विद्याविनोदेनात्मानं रमयते सते ॥

कृता . . . . . ह्रेन्नातटाश्रमे ।
षड्भाषोल्लेखलीलायां रूपचन्द्रः प्रवर्तते ॥

Ends:

राजन् चिरं जीव विधेहि राज्यं चिरं महाराजकुमार जीव ।
आनन्दरामान्वहमेव नन्द श्रीधर्मलाभं सततं लभस्व ॥

इति श्रीनाटिकानुकारिषड्भाषामयपत्रं लिखितं मार्गशीर्षसिततृतीयातिथौ १७८७ वर्षे ।

आनन्दरामस्य कुतूहलार्थं भाषाश्च षड् . . . . . . बोधनार्थम् ।
सर्वज्ञपुत्रत्वकवित्वसंज्ञोन्मादादहमप्यलेखम् (?) ॥

This is given as Samasaṁskṛta:

अथ गुरुः समसंस्कृतेन—

इदमेव नगरमखिलतापविहीनविसारिगुणपीनम् ।
न हि न हि पापाधीन . . . . . . दासीत्वम् ॥

The Nāṭikā is not noticed in any history of Sanskrit Literature.

[The sanskrit portion is written exactly as it is found in the MS. and the mistakes are not corrected.—Ed.].

THE ALL-INDIA ORIENTAL CONFERENCE

THE thirteenth session of the All-India Oriental Conference was held at Nagpur for three days from Saturday the 19th October, 1946. The Conference opened at 3 p.m. in a spacious tent erected for the purpose. Lt. Col. W. R. Puranik, Vice-Chancellor of the Nagpur University and Chairman of the Reception Committee, welcomed the delegates, and Pandit Dwaraka Prasad Misra inaugurated the session. There was a welcome departure in so far as both the above speeches were delivered in Hindi. Mahāmahopādhyāya P. V. Kane occupied the chair and he delivered his Presidential address, which was in English. One wishes that he had prepared his address in Sanskrit. The President made a full survey of the work done in Oriental Research during the last three years, since the Conference met at Benares. He also made some very useful suggestions recommending to the Conference to undertake certain items of important pieces of work. The various sections of the Conference met separately during the following two days. From the list circulated to the Delegates, it is found that a little over 350 delegates must have been enrolled for the Conference. One is not in possession of the actual number of registrations and the actual attendance, at present.

The Conference met in sixteen sections for discussion of Papers. As usual, Sanskrit was the most predominant section. Sanskrit was divided into two sections—Vedic and Classical

Sanskrit. There were 9 Papers for which summaries were printed and 7 for which summaries were not printed, in the Vedic section; and there were 32 Papers in the Classical Sanskrit section, with summaries printed, and 1 Paper without a summary. The other sections are: Philosophy and Religion (25 Papers; only for 15 is summary available); History (21 Papers; only for 16 is summary available); Iranian; Prakrit and Jainism; Maharathi (13 Papers in each of the three; summary for only 12 available in Iranian); Archaeology (11 Papers; summary for 10 available); Hindi (9 Papers; summary for 7 available); Dravidian Languages and Culture (8 Papers); Technical Sciences; Philology and Linguistics (4 Papers for each); Pali and Buddhism (3 Papers); Islamic Culture (3 Papers); Arabic and Persian; Urdu (2 Papers each).

When we come to the contents of the Papers themselves, one has to make a remark that in such conferences, the delegates should, as far as may be, avoid purely subjective presentations of opinions and facts. The length of the Papers is also a chief factor. What is wanted is that the Delegates should have some striking point deserving discussion, presented at the Conference, and then the delegates will have a chance to discuss the matter. Certainly, there are cases where a delegate may have to give a new and important information, which may not lend itself to any discussion. The sections are not meant to read a dissertation; they are places for discussion. Further, the Papers must show an up-to-date acquaintance with facts. I give only two illustrations from the printed summaries. There is a Paper on Dravidian Culture. It is only an expression of an opinion. Then there is the Paper on *Galitas* in the *Padapāṭha* (words dropped in the word-splitting process) in the *Ṛgveda*. Here the author says that there are places where we expect words to be dropped

out according to the general rules, but where we do not see the process in actual practice. If only the author had seen my edition of *Ṛgveda* with Mādhava's commentary in the Adyar Library Series, he would have understood the reason for non-omission in those places. There is something more than three *Padas* coming together. The commentator in this edition explains all such cases, so far as the commentary is available.

From the programme it is found, and that has been the experience also, that the time allotted for discussion of Papers is very inadequate, in so far as important sections like Sanskrit and History are concerned. We must have a minimum of half an hour for a Paper; the author must be able to present his point, that calls for discussion, in ten minutes. Then there must be fifteen to twenty minutes for discussion, each delegate taking only three to five minutes. Thus, for the Classical Sanskrit Section, there must be (taking 32 as the number) over fifteen hours. This is the minimum. If three full days are available, then some justice can be done to the subject.

Here I like to make a suggestion. The splitting up of sections into more than one must have some such basis as the number of Papers available for discussion. The Classical Sanskrit section now contains Papers on *Alaṅkāra* and *Vyākaraṇa* and also some philosophical and ritualist works, besides poems and dramas. Thus the following Papers should not strictly come under Classical Sanskrit: Some aspects of the technique of *Anuvṛtti* in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*; Theory of *Dhvani* in Sanskrit Poetry; Bhāvabhaṭṭa (he is the author of Musical works); Corner-Stone of Rasa Ideology; Vācaspati's Indebtedness to Lakṣmīdhara; Jagannātha's Criticism of Mammaṭa's Definition and Classification of Poetry; Inter-relation of the *Adhyāyas* of

the *Gītā*; *Karma* and Reincarnation in Classical Sanskrit (it has a bearing; yet should go elsewhere); Mahādevavid (this is an astronomy author); Chinese Loans in Sanskrit; Probable Sources of *Bhagavadgītā*; The Seven *Cirajīvins*; A Note On the Date of Sarvajñātman; Authorship and Date of the *Bhagavadgītā*; Three Works of Rāma Vājapeyin Relating to Kātyāyana's *S'ulbasūtra*. This takes away nearly half the number. There is a clear case for splitting up the section into (1) poetry and (2) related subjects (the latter taking up *Alaṅkāra*, *Vyākaraṇa*, Dharmas'āstra, texts in philosophy etc.)

The Oriental Conference is a purely academic institution, and non-academic considerations have no place in it. Yet when we look at the number of Papers submitted to the various sections, it is found that in splitting up the Conference, considerations other than academic, have had much influence. It is the opportunities for the number of sectional presidents for a certain non-academic interest that has been the guiding principle, rather than the opportunities for discussing the number of Papers relating to an academic subject.

An Oriental Conference should comprehend certain subjects which are conspicuous by their absence, so far as the All-Indian Oriental Conference is concerned. It is not an Indological Conference, while, from the subjects taken up by the Conference, it looks more like that than an Oriental Conference. It is true that further expansion is not precluded by any statute governing the constitution and conduct of the Conference; it is also true that the defect has to be traced to the limitations in the educational system in India. Egyptology, Assyriology and other studies relating to ancient civilizations of the east have not yet found their place in the scheme of the All-India Oriental Conference. Ancient

Chinese civilization too does not find a place here. If the Oriental Conference is to take its rightful position among the similar institutions in other parts of the world, the scope of the Conference must expand considerably. This can be done only if there is a corresponding expansion in the scope and aim of research in various Universities and other institutions. The Conference must try to influence the educational policy of the State, so far as Universities are concerned. The Conference must try to become a more potent influence in the higher aspects of the life of the nation, namely, the cultural aspects, as distinct from the common aspects like economics and political alignments. The Conference must lead, and not follow the policy of the State in so far as cultural pursuits are concerned.

The Conference can easily take up certain regular activities, apart from the periodical sessions of the Conference. The President has made some very wise suggestions in his address. An annual bibliography, or a two yearly bibliography (in as much as the Conference usually meets every two years) so far as Oriental studies are concerned, is a very laudable undertaking for the Conference. It must cover not merely the activities within India, but must include also activities in the field of Oriental studies in foreign countries. There is a wealth of information on this point—how much activity there is in other countries on this subject—that is not available in this country. This bibliography must be a reference book. Apart from this, a general review of the work done in the field of Oriental studies will be quite welcome to a wider range of readers.

I have often fancied whether an Orientalists' "Who is Who" will not be a welcome venture for the Conference to undertake. If any private agency takes up the project, it is

quite as good. It can be revised every five biennial periods (*i.e.*, at the end of every five sessions of the Conference); and in the reports of the Conferences, proper additions may periodically be made. Thus there will be a reliable publication giving information about Orientalists and their activities, kept ever up-do-date. It is true that the author side of the bibliography will give most of the information; yet there is scope for such a separate publication.

In the matter of publishing the proceedings of the Conference, there is much scope for more promptness. It must be made a general rule that the addresses of the sectional presidents will be published in advance. They are expected to contain a general review of the work done in their respective fields during the preceding two years; and if they are published only two more years later, the information becomes out of date. The presidential address is always printed in advance; there is no reason why the presidential address of the various sections too shall not have the same importance attached to them. The entire Conference proceedings too must be published at least within a year after the Conference session.

If the report is to truly represent the proceedings of the Conference, I feel that it will be advisable to report also a brief account of the discussions of Papers; just a notice of the points raised during the discussion below the Paper itself will have much informative value. This is a point which the Conference can well consider. I realize the difficulties. But I think that the sectional president, who is assisted by a sectional secretary, can prepare such short minutes of the discussion at the sections.

No statutory provision, no official machinery set in motion, can make the discussion part of the Conference at the

sectional meetings more lively, than what it is at present. One notices that the ceremonial portion of the proceedings is more lively and more spectacular than the real academic side at the Conference.

The ceremonial side can give a colour to the proceedings of the Conference; but it shall not overshadow the real Conference. Considering the normal attendance at the various sections, one finds that only a small portion of the delegates attend the sections. In most of them the attendance is poor. The number of Papers forthcoming in many of the sections is also not at all encouraging. The matter needs attention.

The cause taken by the Conference must, and will, dominate the life of the nation, if India is to occupy in the future, the position which she once held among the nations of the world in ancient times, and if India is to make her real contribution to the future civilization of the world. The Conference must assert, and make felt, its true importance in the cultural life of the nation. For this, the academic side of the Conference must undergo some improvement.

C. KUNHAN RAJA

OBITUARY NOTICES

RAO BAHADUR K. N. DIKSHIT, 1889—1946

IN the premature and much lamented demise of Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, the retired Director-General of Archaeology in India, at Poona on Monday, 12th August 1946, Indian scholarship in general and Indian Archaeology and allied subjects in particular have suffered an irreparable loss. He was one of those rare sons of Bhāratavarṣa who fought their way to the highest offices in their fields and yet maintained a thoroughly democratic and patriotic outlook in their dealings with their subordinates and superiors alike. Extremely social by nature and liberal in his hospitality, the Rao Bahadur was loved and respected by all those who came into contact with him in all parts of India. His child-like simplicity and absence of insularity coupled with a vivacious and cheerful temperament prevented any barriers between him and other scholars inspite of his official eminence, which he used entirely in helping brother-scholars in their quest for truth. My first contact with Rao Bahadur Dikshit was in 1919 at the time of the First Oriental Conference organized by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, which I had just then joined as its Curator and this contact continued owing to my occasional consultations with him about the chronology of several Sanskrit-works even during his long absence from Poona, till it was again revived and deepened in 1944, when

he came to reside in Poona after his retirement and took active part in the activities of all learned bodies in the city and in particular of the B.O.R. Institute, where he was the Vice-Chairman of its Regulating Council, member of the Executive Board, Superintendent of the Manuscripts Department and the Joint-Editor of its research Journal, the *Annals* up to the moment of his death. He was looking forward to the day when Indian Archaeology would be free from the shackles of officialdom and make use of Indian scholarship in its further growth and expansion. Unfortunately he missed the good news of the formation of an Indian Government only by a fortnight but let us hope that the Minister in charge of Indian Archaeology and allied subjects in the new Government will infuse new blood in its activities and train Indian scholars to explore new fields of research in greater cooperation with non-official scholars than hitherto.

Rao Bahadur Dikshit popularly known as Dadasaheb Dikshit was born at Pandharpur on 21st October 1889. He received his early education at Pandharpur and Sangli. In 1905 he passed his Matriculation Examination very creditably by winning the *First Jagannath Shankarsheth Scholarship* of the University of Bombay. He carried out his Collegiate education in the Deccan College, Poona, with a brilliant career by winning the *Varjivandas Madhavadas Sanskrit Scholarship* at the Inter Arts Examination and the much coveted *Bhau Daji Prize* at his B. A. examination in 1909. He was appointed *Dakshina Fellow* of the Deccan College in this year and continued his studies for the M. A. examination which he passed in 1911 with still greater academic laurels to his credit, *viz*: the *Bhagavandas Purushottamdas Sanskrit Scholarship, the Gokuldas Zala Vedanta prize, Sir Lawrence Jenkins Scholarship*

etc. In recognition of the proficiency in Sanskrit displayed by Rao Bahadur Dikshit he was awarded in 1912 a special scholarship by Govt. for training in Archaeology. At the conclusion of his period of training, Dadasaheb was first appointed Curator of the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay, and later he was made the Curator of the Provincial Museum, Lucknow. Between 1920 and 1926 he served as *Superintendent of Archaeology* at Poona and Calcutta. In spite of the temporary displeasure of Govt. which Dadasaheb had to incur on account of his candid criticism and spirit of independence, the rising merit of Dadasaheb's work and worth buoyed up at last and in 1930 he was appointed *Deputy Director General of Archaeology* and later *Epigraphist* for India. This rise to eminence which no superior of Dadasaheb in his Department could stop, was crowned with his appointment in 1937 as *Director-General of Archaeology in India*, a rare honour to be achieved by an Indian scholar under a bureaucratic Government.

Though Rao Bahadur Dikshit worked life-long in the Archaeological Department, the Sanskrit scholar in him was never put in the back-ground. It was his considered opinion that an Indian archaeologist must possess not only a good knowledge of the main Indian Vernaculars but a proficiency in Sanskrit language and culture as well. When Dadasaheb retired in 1944 and came to stay in my neighbourhood at Poona, I had occasions to present to him many of my research papers. I was surprised to see that he not only read these papers closely but was ready with his suggestions and observations whenever we met. In view of Dadasaheb's deep and active interest in Indian languages, history and culture, myself and Dr. S. M. Katre, the Director of the Deccan College Research Institute requested him to take up the Chairmanship

of the Indian Philological Association founded by us in January 1944, and formally inaugurated by Dadasaheb in March, 1944. It is unfortunate that this Association and many other learned bodies in Poona and outside should lose such a dependable friend and guide within two years of his retirement!

Dadasaheb's contribution to the subjects which he had mastered such as Archaeology, Epigraphy, Iconography, Art, Architecture, Numismatics, etc. are too numerous to be recorded in this note. They are enshrined in the several official publications of the *Archaeological Survey of India*, *Epigraphia Indica*, *Journal of the Indian Numismatics Society*, *Proceedings of the Several Sessions of the All-India Oriental Conference*, some of the *Commemoration Volumes* and the several *Oriental Journals* published in India during the last 25 years. A major part of the epoch-making excavation at Mohenjo-Daro was carried out under his supervision and to him must go the credit of many of the discoveries connected with this excavation. The celebrated excavations at Paharpur in Bengal and at Ramnagar in the United Provinces were also planned and executed by Dadasaheb with great originality and skill. Dadasaheb was the fountainhead of inspiration to many younger archaeologists. It was through his direct inspiration, guidance and cooperation that Dr. H. D. Sankalia, head of the History Department of the Deccan College Research Institute carried out his Pre-historic Survey of Gujarat, as also his excavation at Brahmapuri in Kolhapur. Nothing gave Dadasaheb greater pleasure than helping younger scholars in their scholarly work which he wanted to foster in this country by using his abilities and influence in every possible direction. After his retirement Dadasaheb had conceived many plans of scholarly endeavour for the cultural education of the masses through Museums with the cooperation of Governments and the public bodies.

In one of his lectures delivered at the Baroda Museum in December 1944 he observes: "It is desirable that in the task of unravelling India's civilization from age to age the universities and cultural Associations should come forward in a larger measure side by side with the central, provincial and state Governments." Having observed, during his travel to England and Europe, the great role played by Museums in the cultural education of the masses, Dadasaheb carried out certain reforms in the Museums under his official supervision and later founded a *Museum Association of India* for organizing these reforms on a lasting basis.

Dadasaheb's life was vitally connected with the academic activities of several learned bodies in India. Besides his connection with the Bhandarkar Institute already referred to, he was associated with the Deccan College Research Institute, Poona, as a prominent member of its Quinquennial Committee appointed by Government and also as a member of its Council. He was a member of the Managing Committee and Trustee of the Bharata Itihasa Samshodhak Mandal, Poona. He was a fellow of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal and the President of the Numismatic Society of India. He took an active part in the working of the All-India Oriental Conference as a Member of its Executive Committee and also as the sectional President at some of its Sessions. He was also closely connected with the working of the Indian History Congress since its first session in Poona in 1935, being the Sectional President at some of its sessions and the President of the 1942 session, as also a member of the committee for Ancient Period of the "History of India" scheme undertaken by this Congress. He had promised to contribute some chapters to this ***History of India*** as also to the Histories of India undertaken by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay

and another body at Benares. It is an irony of fate that such an eminent scholar should be removed by the cruel hand of death at a time when his mature scholarship and academic experience would have enriched several newly projected publications undertaken by responsible scholars in this country.

Rao Bahadur Dikshit leaves behind him a large family including his wife, four sons and a married daughter. All the children of Rao Bahadur Dikshit are highly educated. The eldest son has gone to America for higher studies. Another son Mr. Sadanand Dikshit, M.A. who is now employed in the Archaeological Department, Baroda, has been trained by his father in the subjects dear to him. I feel sure he will uphold the best traditions of his eminent father in the years to come. In closing this last tribute to the memory of the departed *savant*, I offer my sincere condolences to all the members of his family on behalf of myself and brother scholars in this country.

P. K. GODE

SIR P. S. SIVASWAMI AIYAR

Sir P. S. Sivaswami Aiyar, one of the most conspicuous figures in the public life of Madras for many years, passed away at his Madras residence on the night of the 5th of November, 1946. He was a versatile genius ; Madras cannot boast of another who can be compared with him for his intellectual eminence. As a lawyer, he reached the top of the

profession. As an administrator he won the esteem of all those people who knew him intimately. He was a first rate Sanskrit scholar. He held the highest academic positions, having been the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Madras and of the Benares Hindu University. He had a commanding personality and no one who sees him can forget him. No one will miss him in a crowd ; every one will be impressed by his forceful personality.

He had a special genius to recognize talent. Although it cannot be said that he *discovered* the late Mahāmahopādhyāya Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastriyar, it may be definitely said that it was he who first realized the great genius in that illustrious professor ; and he used his own high position to give the professor the right place that was his due, in the academic life of Madras and also of the whole of India. He never made a wrong calculation in such matters. I was one of the favourite students of Prof. Kuppuswami Sastriyar at the time when Sir Sivaswami Aiyar was the Vice-Chancellor of the Madras University, and this event gave me an opportunity to become known to Sir Sivaswami Aiyar even when I was a student. I cannot forget the first occasion when I had the privilege of meeting him ; he was meticulously careful about pronunciation of English words. Neither pronounciation nor spelling had been my strong points. When I replied some of his questions, he would correct my pronunciation instead of continuing the conversation. I must confess that I felt a little embarassed on this first occasion. I told my professor about this and he consoled me by saying that he had a broad heart and that I could ever depend on him for any assistance in my future academic life. I do not think that I made a good impression on him in the early days. That is what I could gather from the words of my professor.

But later on, when I started my research work in Madras, I knew that he completely changed his opinion. I had been sending him my publications. and he always acknowledged their receipt and he never failed to say a nice word of encouragement in the reply.

Sir Sivaswami Aiyar is not the man to make a thousand promises when a young man goes to him and to keep quiet over them later. As was my own experience, perhaps the first meeting with him may discourage many. But he always remembered what he had in mind and what he did not give out at the interview. The help came that was never promised and that was least expected. Such was his way; and such is the way of the noble minded.

He had one of the best collection of books; there are few private libraries that can be compared with his. He purchased the latest publications on all subjects; he read through all of them very minutely and mastered the contents. He kept himself up-to-date in his knowledge of all subjects. He understood whatever he read; when he said anything, he knew his mind. When he was a member of the Central Legislature, he mastered the problems of Indian Military Organization so thoroughly that even the highest person in the Government who had to handle the subject realized that he was dealing with a person who knew what he was talking about. When he was Vice-Chancellor, he could advice even experts in science-subjects regarding laboratory equipments to the minutest detail.

In him, independence was a stern reality; it was not a mere sentimental defiance of certain institutions and certain ways of life and submission at the same time to the dictation of another. When he did not submit to the vociferous political agitator, it was naturally assumed by the unthinking

mass that he was submitting to a foreign power; and his unbending independence was always interpreted as a sign of weakness by many. It is very doubtful if there is another Indian whose intentions and whose actions in public life have been so misunderstood and misinterpreted as Sir Sivaswami Aiyar. But he never worried himself about what he was thought of by others. He followed public questions very closely and always expressed his opinions clearly and forcefully without any fear of disagreeing with even the most popular figure in public life.

As a politician, he was an unrepentent and impenitent liberal; as an academic man, he was far more liberal. For many years he had been maintaining a High School in his own village, for which he had made a very munificent endowment. Later in life, he gave off all his residue earning as an endowment for the National Girls' High School in Mylapore. But his benefactions did not receive the same advertisement as far lesser benefactions of others; he never lent himself to such publicity either.

He was never a popular leader. He did not possess the the qualifications either for such a rôle in society. He was not a good speaker. He was seldom audible when he spoke from a public platform. He was never emotional and could not appeal to the masses. He did not have the adaptability to environments, the flexibility of convictions, the mobility and adjustability of character, the indifference to consistency, which are all necessary elements to constitute a popular leader of the masses. He was ever too far in advance and too high above the average to be able to keep pace with the masses and to be at the head of a slow moving public loitering in the lower regions.

He gave his full support to all good causes, especially to those that had an academic and cultural leaning. He was a

Vice-President of the Samskrita Academy, Madras and President of the Board of Editors of the *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, both founded by the late Mahāmahopādhyāya Prof. Kuppuswami Sastriyar. He gave his support to the *Bulletin* of the Adyar Library also. A scholar and a thinker, a politician and a statesman, an administrator and a lawyer, he was a true representative of ancient India and a prophet of the future India; being so extensive in his being, he could not contract himself to be fitted into the narrow limits of contemporary conditions. He is an ideal for those who have a vision and an inspiration for those who have an ideal.

C. KUNHAN RAJA

PAṆḌITARĀJA K. RAMAPISHAROTI

The firmament of Sanskrit Pandits lost a bright star by the death on the night of Wednesday the 23rd October, 1946, of Paṇḍitarāja K. Ramapisharoti, an eminent scholar in *Nyāya* and renowned as an authority on Sanskrit literature, who hailed from the Cochin State in Malabar. For many years he had been the Sanskrit Pandit in the Maharaja's College at Ernakulam; after retirement from that position, he spent his time at Tripunithura which is the residence of the Cochin Royal Family. His Highness Rama Varma, familiarly known as Parikshit, now the Elaya Raja (heir-apparent) of Cochin and the late Paṇḍitarāja were life-long friends and colleagues in scholarship and in literary activities. There is a Sanskrit College at Tripunithura. For these reasons, he found a very agreeable home at Tripunithura. The retirement

actually marks the starting of an active literary career for the Paṇḍitarāja. Paṇḍitarāja is a title conferred on him by the Sanskrit College at Tripunithura. He took a keen interest in the affairs of the College and he devoted all his energies to see that the College kept up a high standard in the instruction given to the students. He was a scholar of rare qualities and uncommon abilities. As a teacher, he was highly respected and loved by his students, who are too numerous to be mentioned individually. I am proud to be able to say that I am one of his students and that ever since I had the privilege of studying Sanskrit under him more than thirty years ago, he has been ever a source of inspiration for me in my Sanskrit studies; I enjoyed his regard all along. Whenever I had a chance to go to Malabar, I never missed a pilgrimage (so I must call it) to Tripunithura to pay my respects to my *Guru*. There is a sort of general feeling that the "Pandits" are only a mass of book learning without critical understanding, devoid of any perspective and any sense of proportion; it is also widely held that the plight into which language-studies have fallen in the schools and colleges is due not a little to the way in which the "Pandits" make the subject uninteresting and highly taxing to the students' intellect. In the case of the Paṇḍitarāja I can say from personal experience that if there is any one who could make the study of Sanskrit interesting to a college class, it is this scholar. The way in which he explained the texts, drawing attention to the poetic beauty of the work, keeping to the right proportion in the matter or grammatical details, made the study of Sanskrit supremely interesting. Even his mode of reciting the passages was a source of inspiration for the students. Although he had been keeping indifferent health for a few years now, his zeal for study and his devotion to

Sanskrit never suffered. He had, in collaboration with H.H. the Parikshit Prince of the Cochin Royal family, published a commentary on the *S'ākuntala* about thirty years ago. Recently his commentary on the *Dhvanyāloka*, called the *Bālapriyā*, has been published in the Kashi Sanskrit Series and his commentary on the *Mālavikāgnimitra* was published from Madras in the Balamanorama Press. His commentary on the *Dhvanyāloka* has won for him universal admiration for giving a very informative, and at the same time a very readable and lucid, explanation of this difficult work. His commentary on the *Mālavikāgnimitra* also attempts, and that with great success, at presenting the dramatic beauty of the work. He has written an elaborate commentary on the *S'ukasandes'a* of Lakṣmīdāsa which is awaiting publication. He has also written a commentary on the second part (starting with the tenth *Skandha*) of the *Nārāyaṇīya* of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa. This too has not yet been made available for scholars in print. I had occasion to read both in manuscript form; both are very scholarly and profound. Recently when I met him, I found that he was studying the *Durgāsaptas'atī* with some rare commentaries for the purpose of writing a commentary. Thus to his last, he was a student. It is a matter of wonder how he could devote himself to such serious studies even under extreme physical disabilities. With him disappears a scholar, a literary critic, a friend and guide, and a model of respectability in life.

C. KUNHAN RAJA

DR. LAKSHMAN SARUP

When I opened the newspaper of Monday the 28th of October, I saw there the rather shocking news that Dr. Lakshman Sarup of Lahore had passed away on the afternoon of the 26th. He was present at the session of the All-India Oriental Conference at Nagpur from the 19th to the 21st of the month. Although he was not keeping very good health for some time now, still when I met him at Nagpur, he was looking quite fresh and cheerful. Immediately after his return to Lahore, came his end as a result of heart failure.

He graduated from the Punjab University. At a later time he went to Oxford with a Government of India Scholarship for higher research in Sanskrit. He worked under the late Prof. A. A. Macdonell, at that time the Boden Professor of Sanskrit in the Oxford University. He worked on the *Nirukta* of Yāska and brought out an accurate translation of that work. He was awarded the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (D. Phil.) for his work, and he returned to India. Then he published the text of the *Nirukta* and the Index of the *Nirukta*. He also published the commentary of Mahes'vara, disciple of Skandasvāmin. In the Introductions to these publications he had dealt with various problems regarding the *Nirukta*, the commentators on the *Nirukta* and the commentators on the Vedas. His edition of the *Ṛgveda* with the commentary of Mādhava, son of Veṅkaṭārya giving detailed notes mainly in the form of comparison of his commentary with other vedic commentaries, was in the course of publication when his end came. A few volumes had already appeared. He was one of the foremost Vedic scholars.

He was equally at home in Classical Sanskrit and there are various publications in this field to his credit. He had

studied the Bhāsa problem very minutely. But his immense contribution in the Vedic field overshadowed his valuable contribution to Classical Sanskrit. He was connected with the Oriental College, Lahore, for many years and he has trained a large number of young men in researches; and many of them are well-known at present. The late A. C. Woolner held him in high esteem, and took him as a collaborator in many of his studies. The Punjab University had always kept up a very high standard in Sanskrit; and if in recent times, it had developed into one of the best research centres in India, the credit goes not a little to Dr. Sarup. The width covered in research at Lahore never affected either the depth or the weight. The Punjab Sanskrit Series owes much for its expansion to the co-operation of Dr. Sarup.

Dr. Sarup had been a very prominent member of the All-India Oriental Conference. He has been connected with the Executive Council of the Conference for many years, and he has been also an officer of the Conference. When he passed away, he has been its Treasurer. He has also presided over its sections; he has always contributed Papers for the sessions and took a very lively part in the discussions at the sectional meetings. He was a very clear, fluent speaker, though there was nothing of an orator in him. He explained his points with lucidity, precision and force. This feature we find in all his literary contributions. One may differ from him in many of the points which he had raised during his researches; but no one can miss the wealth of evidence which he always brought together in support of his position.

His students and colleagues at Lahore had great regard for him. In the whole of Lahore, he was very much respected. He was of a very genial nature; a pleasant companion and a cordial friend, he was loved by all who came across him. He

was one of the most popular figures at the Oriental Conference. In him we miss a great scholar and a perfect gentleman. The younger generation loses a reliable guide in their research, and people like me lose an able colleague. His energy can be seen in the volumes he has produced. His enthusiasm was a source of inspiration to his students and also to his colleagues. He was still in the prime of his life; he had not yet retired from service. No one who saw him at the Oriental Conference could have even dreamt that within less than a week after that function, he would be snatched away from our midst. I record the sense of loss sustained by Indian scholarship through his premature death.

C. KUNHAN RAJA

ANNOUNCEMENT

Attention is hereby invited to the Indian Culture Essay Competition conducted by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan on any aspect of Indian Culture, written in Saṁskrit, Hindi or English, for the Annual competitions started by the Bhavan since 1942. The branches of study mentioned below are not exhaustive but only representative, to give an idea to intending competitors. (1) Religion and Philosophy; (2) Art and Architecture; (3) Languages Literature and Linguistic Criticism; (4) History—Political; (5) Social and Economic Order. (6) One Gold Medal and One Silver Medal have been specially donated for the best and next best essay on 'Bhagavad-gītā and Life.' For fuller details intending competitors may address the Registrar, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.

MANUSCRIPTS NOTES

By H. G. Narahari

I. ANOTHER IMPORTANT MS. OF THE NĪTIDVIṢAṢṬIKĀ

In the May issue of this Journal I described a new version of the *Nītidviṣaṣṭikā* of Sundarapāṇḍya given in a Malayalam MS. (XXI. Q. 8) deposited in the Adyar Library. I have since found that there is still another MS. of the work in the Library which also deserves special notice. This is a fairly old palm leaf MS. written in Grantha characters and consisting of 11 folia. It bears the shelf-number XXXIII. F. 28. Compared with the existing printed version of the *Nītidviṣaṣṭikā*, this MS. has a number of *Varietas Lectiones*, all of negligible value, and *thirteen* additional verses. *Eleven* of these verses are already found in the Malayalam MS. referred to above. Only the following *two* verses deserve to be recorded now :

शतमप्यपराधानां सुकृतेनैकेन नाशयत्यार्यः ।
नाशयति सुकृतशतान्यपि नीचस्त्वेकापराधेन ॥ (fol. 33*a*)
यौवनमफलं धनिनां व्रतमफलं दुर्विनीतस्य ।
निर्गुणमप्यनुरक्तं प्रायो न समाश्रितं जगति सन्तः ॥ (fol. 38*a*)

II. THE LONGER RECENSION OF THE KAVIRĀKṢASĪYA

In the last issue of this Journal I described a Malayalam MS. (XXI. Q. 8) in the Adyar Library which gives a version of the *Kavirākṣasīya* different from that contained in either of the two complete editions of it known so far. The Library has *three* more MSS. of the work, *two* in grantha and *one* in Telugu. The Telugu MS. (XXX. J. 2) is incomplete and a detailed study of it now is of no use. As regards the grantha MSS., both are complete but only one of them deserves special mention now. That bearing the number XXXIII. F. 28 gives a version which is in no way different from the existing printed editions except for a few verbal variations here and there which are of no literary value. But the other MS (XIX. N. 7) gives a text totally unknown so far. It differs radically from the two available printed editions. Not only does it omit verses found in both, but also it adds a very large number of its own to the existing stock. Of the Telugu edition, for instance, it omits 46 verses but adds in its turn 259 verses; while the former text has no subdivisions, the MS. divides the text into *three* books each of which is called a *śataka*.[1] The MS. can thus be said to give the *longer* recension of the poem, while what we have so far, including the Malayalam MS. referred to above, forms the *shorter* recension.

I am planning to bring out soon in this Journal an edition of the *Kavirākṣasīya* based on this MS. I will take then the opportunity to show in detail how the *two* recensions are widely divergent. I content myself now only with announcing the existence of a new and longer recension of this important and interesting didactic poem.

---

[1] The Devanāgari edition of the poem (*Sūktisaṅgraha*, N. S. Press, Bombay, 1901) also divides the text into *five* sections called *paddhatis*; but all these together make only 103 verses less by two than the Telugu edition with which otherwise the edition is more or less identical.

KĀTANTRAVṚTTIPRAKĀŚA BY KARMADHARA

BY PANDIT V. KRISHNAMACHARYA

THIS is a very rare and important manuscript. The MS. is not available in any other Library and is not even mentioned in Aufrecht's *Catalogus Catalogorum*. There is a paper MS. in the Adyar Library. Shelf No. 40. B. 23. Paper. 360 Foll. $10\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ inches. 11 lines in a page. Devanāgarī script Old. Slightly injured. Good writing. The folios are numbered 1 to 406; but some folios are missing in the middle. The MS. breaks off in the 2nd Chapter.

It is believed that the *Kātantrasūtras* were composed by S'arvavarman in the first century A.D. MM. Haraprasada S'astri definitely fixes the date 89 A.D. for the work. About the eighth century A.D. Durgasiṁha wrote a vṛtti on the *Kātantrasūtras*. The work under notice is a commentary on the vṛtti of Durgasiṁha. The author Karmadhara was the son of Lakṣmīdhara of the Kāyastha family. The verses found in the beginning of the work are interesting and I give below an extract from them.

शेषाशेषफणामणिव्यतिकरे कान्ताकृतिं बिम्बितां
पश्यन्ती रहसि स्थितापि परिषद्भ्रान्त्या यियासुर्मुहुः ।
या प्रौढापि नवं समागमरसं भावैः समातन्वती
श्लिष्टा गाढमुरःस्थलेन हरिणा लक्ष्मीः श्रियै सास्तु वः ।
त्रिलोचनख्यातमभिन्नदुर्गं शर्वं नमस्कृत्य विविक्तविद्यम्
कातन्त्रसूत्रार्थविनिश्चयार्थमयं प्रयत्नः क्रियते शिशूनाम् ॥
दुर्गत्वमुन्नीय स पञ्जिकाया वृत्तेर्विवेके विजयः प्रवृत्तः ।
विवेचयंस्तद्वचनानि वाग्मी स्वयं पुनर्दुर्गतमो बभूव ॥
ततस्तु तां युक्तिभिरुक्तिमुक्ताविविक्तपङ्क्तिं क्वचिदप्यमुष्य ।
संयोजयिष्ये निजगीर्गुणेन सतां हृदि श्रीमतिं संश्रयाय ॥
त्रिलोचनाम्नायवचःप्रसादाद् दुर्गस्य वृत्तिः सुगमा यदीयम् ।

क्वचित्क्वचिन्मे वचसोऽवकाशः शिलोञ्छवृत्त्या घटते तथापि ॥
अभूत् किलाम्भोरुहभूप्रभूते कायस्थवंशे धरणीवतंसे ।
विश्वोपकारव्रतरक्षणेन श्रीमेघनामा धृतमेघनामा ॥
महोपकारोऽत्र महोदयश्च यशश्च भूवल्लभवल्लभत्वम् ।
इत्यादृतासौ किल वैद्यविद्यामनेकविद्याधिगमे कृतेऽपि ॥
जातस्तत्तनयस्त्रिलोचन इति ख्यातस्त्रिवेदीविदा-
माधारो . . . . भुवनप्रख्यातकीर्तिव्रजः ।
त्रैवर्गीं समुपासनामभिदधच्चित्तं त्रिनेत्रे दध-
द्यः शास्त्रेण दृशा द्वयादधिकया स्वं नाम सार्थं व्यधात् ॥
तस्यात्मजः समभवत्कुलशीलशान्तिक्रियाविवेकविविधोर्जितदानदीक्षः
भक्त्या गदाधरपदाधरवर्तिमूर्धा नाम्ना गदाधर इति प्रथितप्रकर्षः ॥
येनातुरतरदेहाद्विधरयता सपदि विषमगदजातम् ।
निजनामान्वितमूहे वैद्यसमूहे प्रगीतसद्यशसा ॥
पुत्रस्तस्याजनि तनिमतामायुषां संप्रदाता
धातेत्याख्यां पृथगपि वहन् भूधरो धीरधैर्यः ।
यो भूस्थैर्यं व्यधित जनितोल्लाघतासंविधाना-
द्धर्मोद्रेकादपि च जनयन्नक्षयं नाम निन्ये ॥
अमुष्मादुद्भूतो नय इव वपुष्मान्नियतिमान्
सुधाधामेवाब्धेर्जगति भवनाथः स्तुतकथः ।
पितृभ्यामाराध्य त्रिभुवनगुरुं यो ह्यधिगत-
स्ततस्तन्नामासीत्प्रथितपृथुकीर्तिर्दिशि दिशि ॥
आर्ताननार्तानातन्वन् धन्वन्तरिसमक्रमः ।
यशोधनो यः सुखिनीश्चक्रे तात्कालिकीः प्रजाः ॥
विद्यां विश्वजनीनां परंपरीणां वहन्नपि प्रगुणाम् ।
शब्दागमसदलंकृतिसाहित्यैकाश्रयो योऽभूत् ॥
साहिश्रीमहमूदतो वसुमतीचक्रैकशक्राद्गुण-
ग्रामैस्तोषितचेतसोऽधिगतवान् सत्कारपूर्वां श्रियम्

कृत्वा सद्वसतिं शुभे सुरसरित्कूले करे पत्तने
भेजे यस्त्रिगणं विभज्य समया भक्त्या सुमित्रान्वितः ॥
तत्तनयः श्रितविनयो विधृतनयः सुकृतसंचयस्थिरधीः ।
अत्युन्नतनिजवंशप्रदीप इव देवनाथोऽभूत् ॥
पुण्यश्रियां तत्फलमाशिषां वा सच्छ्रोत्रियाणां परितोषितानाम् ।
श्रीभावनाथेन सुमित्रया च योऽसावसावि द्युतिमान् सुजन्मा ॥
जितेन्द्रियोऽसौ भविता पदच्युतैर्नृपैरपि स्वस्थितयेऽर्थनीयः ।
दैवज्ञजातैरिति निर्मितेन यो देवनाथत्वमियाय नाम्ना ॥
गुणैरनूनैर्विवशीकृतस्य हुसेनसाहेः सचिवत्वमेत्य ।
गवां द्विजानामपि यः शरण्यो भग्नान् प्रतिष्ठापयति स्म राज्ञः ॥
यस्तन्वन् प्रतिधन्वं दिशि दिशि सरसीः शुचीरपः सृजतीः ।
पथि पथि भक्ष्यविशेषैः परिपूर्णां च प्रपां व्यतनोत् ॥
आरामैरभिरामान् ग्रामान् यः पात्रसात्कृतवान् ।
सुचिरं सत्रमतानीद्वाराणस्यादितीर्थेषु ॥
गवां सहस्रं यद्दत्तं श्रोत्रियैरुपभुज्यते ।
दत्त्वा प्रत्याददानस्तु सूर्योऽस्तं याति किं ह्रिया ॥
बलिप्रभृतिभिर्दत्ता विष्णवे मृन्मयी मही ।
सैव स्वर्णमयी येन सह शैलवनादिभिः ॥
ब्रह्माण्डं यो व्यतरदखिलं श्रोत्रियेभ्यो विभज्य
स्थानाभावादिव परमतो यद्यशो गन्तुमैच्छत् ।
हैमं शैलं सुरविटपिनं कामधेनुं च दत्त्वा
तत्स्वामित्वादिव शतमखं योऽनुनिन्ये प्रतीष्टम् ॥
पुत्रा यदीयाः षडमी पवित्रचरित्रचित्रीयितविश्वभागाः ।
सौभाग्यभाग्योपचयैरनूनाः सत्कीर्तिमूर्तिस्थितिनीतिभाजः ॥
शिवनाथो रघुनाथो रघुरिव वंशोन्नतेः कर्ता ।
सोम इवातिद्युतिमान् ख्यातः श्रीसोमनाथश्च ॥
श्रीवीरनाथोऽपि रणे प्रवीरो धन्यो वदान्यः सुकृती कृती च ।

श्रीवादिनाथश्च तथादिनाथो धृताद्यनाथस्मृतिचारुचित्तौ ॥
स देवनाथः स्फुटमेव यस्य पश्चाप्यमी नन्दनकल्पवृक्षाः ।
श्रीराघवाद्या मणिमण्डिताङ्गाः शाखाभृतोऽप्यीप्सितमुत्सृजन्ति ॥
भ्रातुः कनिष्ठस्य पदेऽभिषिक्तो यद्गोपिनाथोऽपि परोपशान्त्यै ।
ततोऽपि यो व्यञ्जितवान्मघोनः सख्यं न नाम्ना शुचिकर्मणापि ॥
पुत्रपौत्रीणभावेऽपि योऽभ्यमित्रीणतां रणे ।
दधद्विद्यासु पारीणोऽप्यभूदध्ययनप्रियः ॥
कलापके व्याकरणे गभीरे संदेहसंदोहमपाकरिष्यन् ।
निबन्धमेतं बहुयुक्त्युपेतं सोऽचीकरत्कर्मधरेण तेन ॥
याशोधरायणो योऽसौ लक्ष्मीधरसुतः सुतः ।
यः कृती याज्ञरूपेयः श्रोत्रपेयवचोऽमृतः ॥

यशोधरलक्ष्मीधरयोश्च निजकीर्तिपद्यान्गद्यापि श्रूयन्ते—

श्रीरुद्रसिंहस्य निदेशवर्ती यशोधरः शाब्दिकचक्रवर्ती ।
कवित्ववक्तृत्वकलानिवासो जागर्ति भूमौ नवकालिदासः ॥
द्राक्षा दक्षा न कक्षामनुभवितुमलं का कथा काकलानां
कौमत्ये कोकिलानां विधुरुचि न रुचिर्द्राङ् मुधाभूत्सुधापि ।
वीणा प्रावीण्यहीना मधुरिमधुरयाहापि हैयंगवीनं
यस्माद्याशोधरी सा जगति विजयते भारती भारतिभ्याम् ॥
मधुरिमगुणगर्भवैदर्भसंदर्भसर्वस्वगीः
कलितसकलशब्दमर्मागमः शर्ववर्मा न किम् ।
रसमयमृदुगद्यपद्यानवद्यः स लक्ष्मीधरः
प्रभवति वरवैरिवर्गाधिसर्गाग्निसर्गार्चितः ॥
वाररुचं परिशिष्टं टीकामपि वार्धमानिकोपाताम् ।
विद्यानन्दप्रभृतिं समीक्ष्य चिरमेष यत्नो मे ॥
हे धीराः शृणुतावधाय विदधे नद्धाञ्जलिं मूर्धनि
त्यक्त्वालस्यमपास्य हास्यमिह संधेयं निबन्धे मनः ।

किं वा किं विनयोत्करेण यदि वः कातन्त्रतन्त्रेप्सुता
तत्सेव्यो भवितायमेव यदि वा स्वार्थोऽयमारभ्यते ॥
द्वयमेतदसंबद्धं खलता सुमनस्विता ।
किं तु संभाव्यते क्वापि खलतासु मनस्विता ॥

Colophon on fol. 88 (*a*)

इति श्रीकरणकुलावतंसश्रीदेवनाथसमादिष्टपण्डितश्रीकर्मधरविरचिते कातन्त्रमन्त्रप्रकाशे पञ्चमः सन्धिपादः समाप्तः ।

From the extract given above the following facts are known regarding the work and its author. Durgasiṁha wrote a vṛtti or gloss on the *Kātantrasūtras* of S'arvavarman. Trilocanadāsa wrote a commentary on Durgasiṁha's *vṛtti* and the commentary was called *Pañjikā*. Then Vijayānanda wrote another commentary on Durgasiṁha's vṛtti thinking that the *Pañjikā* of Trilocanadāsa was difficult to understand ; but in fact Vijayānanda's commentary became more difficult than the *Pañjikā*. In this connection our author criticizes Vijayānanda as *Vāgmin*. Thus Durgasiṁha's *vṛtti* remained not understandable by average students. That is why our author Karmadhara ventured to write the commentary on Durgasiṁha's *vṛtti* in a simple manner. Karmadhara traces the genealogy of his patron Devanātha thus : In the Kāyastha family there was a great person called Megha. Though he was proficient in all branches of learning he was specially attached to the medical science with immense love. Megha's son was one Trilocana who was well-versed in Vedas and S'āstras as well. Trilocana's son was Gadādhara whose skill in medicine was appreciated in the assemblies of experts in the subject. Gadādhara's son was Bhūdhara, a great physician. Bhūdhara's son was Bhavanātha who loved much grammar and rhetoric though his hereditary subject was medical science. He was honoured and patronized by the Emperor Muhammad Shah and spent the latter part of his life on the bank of Ganges with his wife called Sumitrā. Bhavanātha's son was Devanātha who was the minister of

Husain Shah and helped many kings in regaining their lost kingdoms. He also instituted many inns, gardens and made gifts of villages to worthy persons. He was the patron of our author. Devanātha had six sons called (1) S'ivanātha, (2) Raghunātha, (3) Somanātha, (4) Vis'vanātha, (5) Vādinātha and (6) Ādinātha. He also had a brother called Gopinātha.

As regards his ancestry the author describes himself as the son of Lakṣmidhara and Yajñarūpā and grandson of Yas'odhara who was a great poet and artist. Yas'odhara was also a grammarian, and is said to have borne the title Navakālidāsa. He was patronized by the king Rudrasiṁha.

Karmadhara mentions in the work many authors including Vardhamāna (the author of the *Vistara* a commentary on the *Kātantrasūtra*), Pṛthvīdhara (a Commentator on Vardhamana's *Vistara*) Gotama and Nāganāyaka (commentators on the *Kātantrasūtras*), Kuḷacandra (author of the *Durgavākyaprabodha*), S'arvavarman (author of the *Uṇādivṛtti* of Kātantra school), S'rīpati (author of the *Kātantrapariś'iṣṭa*). Vidyānanda (commentator on the *Amarakos'a*) and *Kātantraprakīrṇaka*) and S'ūdraka (a commentator on the *Amarakos'a*).

As regards the date of the author we have to consider the reference to Rudrasiṁha, the patron of Yas'odhara, the grandfather of our author. The king Rudrasiṁha is known to have written a work called *Vijñānataraṅgiṇī* copy of which is available in the Tanjore Palace Library (Vide No. 3736, Vol. VI of the *Descriptive Catalogue* of the Library). Rudrasiṁha mentions himself as the son of Dalela Siṁha. Vide the stanza found in the *Vijñānataraṅgiṇī* :

भक्तिज्ञानविवर्धनीं श्रुतवतां कर्णे सुधास्पर्धिनीं
साधूनां सुधियां विमूढमनसामप्याशयोल्लासिनीम् ।
श्रीमच्छङ्करदासवर्णनमयीं रम्यां जगत्पावनीं
सीतारामगिरीन्द्रजाहरगुणग्रामाधिवासोज्ज्वलाम् ॥

दोरुद्दामभुजङ्गविक्रमविषज्वालावलीढाखिल-
द्विड्वर्गस्य दलेलसिंहनृपतेः प्रख्यातकीर्तेः सुतः ।
राधाकृष्णपदारविन्दमधुपः श्रीरुद्रसिंहः सता-
मक्रीतानुचरो मुदा प्रकुरुते पूर्वां शुभाख्यायिकाम् ।

Colophon :

" इति श्रीमच्छङ्करदासचरणनखचन्द्रचन्द्रिकासादरपानमात्रैकावलम्बनात्मचकोरश्रीमहारुद्रसिंहविरचितायां रामगुणभूधरप्रसुतायां कृष्णनवनीरदस्नेहासारसलिलपूरितायां विज्ञानतरङ्गिण्यां श्रीशङ्करदासगोलोकनिवासवर्णनं नाम षोडशः कल्लोलः समाप्तः ॥ "

S'aṁkaradāsa on whom the work Vijñānataraṅgiṇī was written is mentioned as a king and said to have written a work called Haṭhasaṁketacandrikā (Vide Aufrecht's *Catalogus Catalogorum*, Vol: I, page 753). The work Vijñānataraṅginī is said to have been composed in the year 1411 A.D. (Vide M. Krishnamachari's *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*, page 433). Karmadhara also states that the work *Kātantravṛttiprakās'a* was written under the instance of Devanātha who was the minister of Emperor Husain Shah. There are evidences to identify the Muhammadan Chief called Husain Shah with the famous Alauddin Husain Shah of Bengal. It is said that the King Husain, the last independent King of Jaunpur being overcome by Bahlol Lodi about 1476 A.D. took refuge with Emperor Husain Shah referred to above. The period of his ruling over Bengal has been fixed as 1493 to 1519 A.D.' Vincent A. Smith writes about the Emperor Husain Shah thus: " Frequent references are found in old Bengali literature indicating the esteem and trust in which the Emperor Husain Shah was held by the Hindus. In fact it seems to be true that the patronage and favour of the Muhammadan emperors and chiefs gave the first start towards the recognition of Bengali in the Courts of the Hindu Rajas who under the guidance of their Brahmin teachers were more inclined to encourage Sanskrit." (Vide page 264 of the

Oxford History of India by V. A. Smith, second edition 1923). Karmadhara also says that Bhavanātha. the father of Devanātha was patronized by Muhammad Shah who may be identified with Muhammad Shah III, 1463 A.D. (Vide page 279 of the *History of India* by V. A. Smith, mentioned above). Taking into consideration all the references mentioned above, we may fix the author in the last quarter of the 15th Century A.D.

The commentary is written in a simple manner and easy style with necessary and useful discussions on the views of other commentators on the work. The commentator says that the *Kātantravyākaraṇa* is also called Kaumāra, Kalāpa and Kālāpa. In explaining the above mentioned titles he states—that the work is called Kātantra because it is shorter and simpler than Pāṇinīya. It is called Kaumāra because it was composed by him through the grace of God Kumāra or Subrahmaṇya. In this connection he also adds that the work was written in order to educate the King S'ālivāhana in grammar. (Vide—अत्र किल मिलितनिखिलविद्वज्जनायां मीमांसितसकलशास्त्रतत्त्वायां परिषदि शालिवाहनाभिधानमवनीश्वरं बोधयितुं कृतप्रतिज्ञेन शर्ववर्मणाचार्येणाराधितः प्रसादितात्मदर्शनो भगवान् कुमारो निजव्याकरणज्ञानमाविर्भावयितुं श्लोकपादरूपमुद्देशसूत्रमवोचत् सिद्धो वर्णसमाम्नाय इति ।). Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasada Sastri in his Introduction to the *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Collections of Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. VI, 1931 says that the work was written in 69 A.D. and adds the following tradition on the origin of the work—" one of the Kings of the S'ātavāhana dynasty took a wife from Northern India; she spoke Sanskrit which he did not understand, and often made curious and ludicrous mistakes. At last unable to bear the jeerings of his wife, he made up his mind to study Sanskrit, and asked his Pandit S'arvavarman to write a treatise on grammar, that would give him a workable knowledge of Sanskrit. S'arvavarman produced a grammar which in six months gave the king what he wanted. This tradition is given in detail in H.P.R. III, 50." The work is also called Kālāpa

because it was composed by the author who belonged to Kālāpa S'ākhā. He also states that it is called *Kalāpavyākaraṇa* by Gauḍas because the author approached God Kumāra with Kalāpa (a feather of peacock) in his hand to know as to what name would be appropriate to the work and Kumāra replied that the work must be named *Kalāpavyākaraṇa* because the author came to him with Kalāpa. In the middle of the commentary he quotes the following verse :

इमैश्च वाक्यैश्च शुभैश्च रम्यैः प्रभातकाले नृपमन्दिरस्थः ।
श्रीविक्रमादित्यविबोधनाय काम्पिल्यनागः स्तवनं करोति ॥

Though the colophons read the name of the work as *Kātantra-mantraprakās'a*, the reading apparently must be mistake for *Kātantravṛttiprakās'a* or *Katantrasūtraprakās'a* as there is no justification for the inclusion of the word ' mantra ' in the title.

REVIEWS

Vedic Bibliography by Dr. R. N. Dandekar, Published by the Karnatak Publishing House, Bombay 1946. Price Rs. 15.

If we are to make steady progress in our research, we must have an accurate and comprehensive account of what has been done in the field prior to any particular stage. It is only in this way that we can avoid going over the same field again and also avoid going backward in our movements. It will also help us in seeing that no part has been left unexplored in our survey, an omission which will necessitate a return to an early part. Even the best specialist in any field cannot have at his command at all times a systematic and well-arranged account of the activities of others and of even himself, through his own specialised activity; he requires such material prepared for him by a specialist in such systematic and orderly presentation of the facts.

This Vedic bibliography prepared by the eminent research scholar, Dr. R. N. Dandekar of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, satisfies a need strongly felt by all Vedic scholars. Prof. L. Renou of Paris had published a similar Bibliographic Vedique which brought the subject up to 1930, and this is a continuation of that monumental work. At the same time, the author amplifies Renou's work for the period prior to 1930, by filling up certain entries that did not find a place there. Editions of texts with or without commentaries, translations, studies, notes etc., all articles bearing on the subject : everything has been noticed in this bibliography. The whole work is divided into 21 main chapters and each such chapter is subdivided into various sections, 168 in number. There is one chapter devoted to the Indus Valley

Civilization, which is a novel feature of this work ; this is the first time that a comprehensive bibliography on that subject has been prepared.

The work contains over 3500 entries. In the list of Journals, periodicals etc. that have been utilised in preparing this work, there are noticed nearly 300 names. This itself is proof of the labour that the author had to undertake to bring out such a work. After the main text, covering 314 pages, there is a supplement which amplifies the information contained in the main portion, giving new entries that did not find a place there. This is followed by a list of authors cited in the whole work and an index of words.

On the occasion of the Silver Jubilee of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute nearly four years ago, there was published a twenty five years survey of the work done in the field of Oriental studies. That was a general survey ; that contained much of bibliographical material. But that was not a bibliography. This book supplies the whole material for a particular field, while that publication was a review of the field.

It is necessary to prepare such bibliographies for all the various sections of the field of Oriental studies. Annual bibliographies can be prepared for the whole field, and at intervals of ten or fifteen years consolidated bibliographies for each of the sections can be prepared separately, as otherwise the annual bibliographies may themselves become too unwieldy for reference.

It requires enormous patience to prepare all the entries. It requires more dexterity to analyse them and classify them. It requires a real genius to present them in such a clear way as is done in this book. The work is not a mere list of authors and works arranged under a few headings. Under most of the entries there is a small notice giving useful information about the work.

The printing has been done very neatly and the proof reading has been carried out with great care. In ancient India, the scholars had produced immense analytical matter for critical studies of the subjects. This is specially the case in the matter

of the Vedic studies in ancient times in India. Through such publications we are now reviving our ancient traditions. There might have been some relapse in Indian scholarship. But the achievements of young scholars have shown that Indians are capable of keeping the highest standards in analytical faculty, critical examination and lucid presentation. This publication is not merely a great help for scholars; it is also a model for scholars.

EDITOR

Catalogue of the Anup Sanskrit Library, prepared by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja and K. Madhava Krishna Sarma, Fasciculus II, Pages 101-200, 1946.

This second *fasciculus* of the Catalogue continues the first part of the work which was reviewed in the columns of this *Bulletin*, Vol. IX, part 2, pp. 72-74. The Gīta section is completed on p. 105 and the Dharma-s'āstra section ranges from pp. 106 to 200. As the fasciculus shows the last entry with the title *Pañcadas'a-karma* the section will continue into the next fasciculus also.

The content of the catalogue for the section on dharmas'āstra is divided into twenty-two sections. First come the mūla smṛtis. The next treats of Ācāra, the third section on Ās'auca, fourth on Āhnika, fifth on Karmavipāka, sixth on Kālanirṇaya, seventh on Kuṇḍavidāna, eighth on Jātinirṇaya, ninth on Tīrtha, tenth on Dāna, eleventh on Pratiṣṭhā, twelfth on Prāyas'citta thirteenth on Māhātmyas, fourteenth on Vivāha, fifteenth on Vyavahāra, sixteenth on Vrata, seventeenth on S'ānti, eighteenth on S'rāddha, nineteenth on Sanyāsa twentieth on Snāna, the twenty-first on *nibandhas* of a comprehensive nature and the twenty-second on Prakīrṇaka.

Of these sections the twenty-first section forms the biggest single section, and is represented by Numbers 2313 to 2671. The section on dharmas'āstra begins from No. 1402 and the last number on p. 200 is 2720. The collection is a fairly representative one and one of the most important collections which contain

rare volumes not available in other Libraries. Many of the manuscripts are dated and the dates range from, A.D. 1414 (p. 108) to A.D. 1735 (p. 148). One can also notice that the manuscripts seem to have originally belonged to groups of scholars as represented by families of father, son, grandson and so on. The name Sarvavidyānidhāna Kavīndrācārya Sarasvatī occurs in the list several times as the owner of the manuscripts, as also Maṇirām etc.

The section on nibandhas, which is the biggest single section, contains the most important of the manuscripts. The *Kalpataru* of Lakṣmīdhara is represented by five manuscripts containing the Gṛhastha, Rājadharma, Niyatakāla and Vyavahāra Kāṇḍas (p. 170). The *Todarānanda* is fully represented in all its sections in this Library. Prof. Kane noticing the sections of *Todarānanda* available to him when he wrote his first volume of the *History of Dharma Śāstra* in 1930 (pp. 421-423) could mention only some of the sections and not all the twenty-one which are represented in this Library. The date of composition of the work is fixed by Prof. Kane between 1565 and 1589 A.D. Some of the manuscripts of *Todarānanda* in the Bikaner Library belong to the time of Todar Mal himself as the dates they bear are A.D. 1573, 1574, and 1582. No. 2250 bears the date A.D. 1680 and relates to Saṁskāra. The section on Saṁhitā-saukhya is dated A.D. 1645.

The *Catalogue* gives a detailed account of the manuscripts in a short compass and justifies the name '*Classified List*.' The necessary information required regarding any particular manuscript is given in six columns. The column on Remarks contains useful information. The present *Catalogue* can easily form the basis for a future Descriptive Catalogue with a little more effort and entry into details. The editors deserve congratulation for having brought out this second fasciculus proving the richness or the Bikaner Library. The completion of the further parts of the *Catalogue* is awaited with pleasure and interest.

A. N. KRISHNAN

Digvijayamahākāvya by Meghavijayagaṇi, edited by Pandit Ambalal Premchand Saha, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1945. Price Rs. 5-12-0.

This is number 14 in the Singhji Jaina Series published by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan. The book opens with a life-sketch of Babu Shri Bahadur Singhji Singhi who has made a munificent endowment for bringing out these Jain publications, and with an account of his activities in connection with the starting of the Series. Then after a short preface by Shri. Jinavijayamuni, the General Editor of the Series, there is a detailed introduction by the editor. After a short notice about the manuscripts and the author in general there is a discussion on the works of the author according to subjects: *Kāvya, Nyāya, Vyākaraṇa, Jyotiṣa* and *Adhyātma.* This is followed by brief observations on the poem and a summary of the work. All this is in Gujarati.

Then comes the text, a Sanskrit poem in 13 cantos describing the life of Vijayaprabhāsūri who was the sixty-first in descent from Mahāvīra, the 'prophet' of Jainism, in the pontifical line. The first 24 verses of the first canto are devoted to an invocation to the 24 *Tīrthaṅkaras*; then Gautama, Indrabhūti and other Gaṇadharas, the disciples of Mahāvīra who is also the 24th of the *Tīrthaṅkaras*, are praised; this is followed by an appreciation of good scholars and an attack on bad critics. Then the story begins with a long description of Jambūdvīpa. The whole of the second canto is devoted to a description of Bhāratavarṣa. The third canto deals with the life and teachings of Mahāvīra. In the next canto is described the life of Vijayadevasūri, the sixtieth in descent from Mahāvīra. His direct disciple was Vijayaprabhāsūri, the hero of the poem, whose pilgrimages and social and religious works form the subject matter of the remaining cantos. The fifth, sixth and seventh cantos describe his tour to the north, north-east and west respectively. The eighth canto is mainly devoted to the description of the city of S'ivapuri (Siroli) and of Pārs'vajina S'aṅkhes'vara worshipped there. The next canto describes his pilgrimage from

Siroli to Medinīpuri through Jalandhar. The following four cantos deal with his tour to the east, and contain picturesque descriptions of the city of Agra, the rivers Ganges and Jumna, and the mountain *Sammeta*.

There are two *ṭippaṇis*, one by the author himself and the other by the editor, explaining the meanings of difficult words. The text is given at the top of the page, and below that come the *ṭippaṇis*.

The author Meghavijayagaṇi is one of the best Jaina poets, and has to his credit as many as 24 works on diverse subjects literary and scientific. He is a great Sanskrit scholar with perfect mastery over the language. In the work under review the poet conforms to many of the features of the Mahākāvya laid down by rhetoricians. In the course of the narration there is plenty of occasion for long descriptions of various objects. The author was a Jaina monk of the S'vetāmbara sect, who flourished towards the close of the seventeenth century, and was a younger contemporary of Vijayaprabhasūri, the hero of the poem. Hence his accounts have a historical value which many other biographical Kāvyas like the *S'aṅkaravijaya* hardly possess. The poem also sheds much light on contemporary social and religious conditions of the Jaiṇas. But the chief attraction of the book lies in its literary merit. The poem is undoubtedly one of the best Sanskrit Mahākāvyas of the Jainas.

The correct reading on page 74, line 2, should be जगत्पतेरिति instead of जगत्पतिरिति. On page 17, line 5, the metre requires नृणां instead of नॄणां.

The editor Sri Ambala Premchand Saha has done his work with meticulous care in a scholarly and thorough manner. The printing and get-up of the book are very good, quite in keeping with the other volumes of the Series. The authorities of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan are to be congratulated on the excellent work they are doing in publishing such important literary works little known to the general public.

K. KUNJUNNI RAJA

Rasaratnapradīpikā of Allarāja, Edited by Dr. R. N. Dandekar, 1945. Price Rs. 2-12-0.

This is No. 8 in the Bharatiya Vidya Series. This is the first time that this work has been edited. It is a small work on *Alaṅkāra* śāstra dealing with *Rasa*, in six chapters. The author is Allarāja son of Hammīra, whom the editor has identified as a king of Ranasthambha, one of the many kings whom Allauddin Khilji defeated. His date, namely, early in the fourteenth century, fits in well with the possible date of the work, as determined from citations in it and from references to it. The great difficulty is that an Allarāja is not known to history. It may be, as the editor suggests, a name assumed by him. The work deals in the classical style, with *Bhāvas*, *Vibhāvas* and *Anubhāvas*, *Vyabhicāribhāvas*, the eight *Rasas* and *Bhāvas*, *Hāvas*, etc., of heroines. There is an Introductory chapter where the author gives some information about himself, that he was the son of Hammīra who had conquered Koṅkaṇa. But there is no Hammīra whose conquest of Koṅkaṇa is known so prominently in history. For this reason the identity of the author still remains to be definitely settled. The Notes that follow draw attention to the works on *Alaṅkāra* with which the statements in the text have intimate relation, among other things. There is an index of authors and works mentioned in the text, and a concordance of passages taken up for illustrations in this text which are found in other *Alaṅkāra* works also. The last item in the work is an index of stanzas quoted in the work.

The editorial work has been executed with the usual accuracy and thoroughness associated with the name of Dr. Dandekar. The Introduction deals exhaustively with the work and the author and the date.

EDITOR

Administration Report of the Archaeological Department, 1120 M.E.; Government of Trvancore by R. Vasndeva Poduval, B.A., Director of Archeology, Trivandrum, 1946.

The present report covers the Malabar year 1120, corresponding to 1944-1945. The activities of the Department were confined to the fields of Exploration, Epigraphy, Conservation and Excavation. Fifteen inscriptions not hitherto noticed by the Department were discovered and deciphered. The dates of these range from the thirteenth century A.D. in vatteluttu characters to A.D. 1893 in Tamil script. The third inscription appears to be a duplicate copy of No. 15 of 1113 M.E. and so is not a new one.

On the side of conservation six kalmaṇḍapams, being dated monuments and falling between A.D. 1640 and 1775 and known as way-side rest houses, were renovated, as they were found to be in a state of decay.

The excavation activities have proved more fruitful this year. A trial excavation at Velimala in South Travancore on the slope of a hillock situated in Kalapaṭidesam in the Kalkulam Taluq has revealed old burial urns, 23 of which have been excavated. The shape of the urns is the same though there is difference in size. A tabular statement of the measurements of the urns is given in page 4. The pottery is unburnt. The belief is that these urns were used to put in very old people who on account of age became 'bent-backs' and on their death were put in pots along with fried paddy and closed with suitable lids and then buried.

The second excavation was conducted on the ruins of the site of an old palace in the same Kalkulam Taluq on a vacant land and 7 furlongs from the Padmanabhapuram palace. The chief object was to verify the tradition of the existence of a subterranean passage connecting the palace of Padmanabhapuram with the place that had fallen into ruins on the vacant site. At a depth of five feet from the ground a flight of granite steps three feet in length was discovered with four more steps above. The operations were interrupted by inceasant rain. The further investigation of the site is therefore likely to prove fruitful and important.

A. N. KRISHNAN

Tantrasamuccaya of Nārāyaṇa with two commentaries, 1945, Price Rs. 7-0-0.

This is number 151 in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series now published by the University of Travancore. This has been very ably edited by the Curator, Prof. V. A. Ramaswami Sastri. The text with the commentary called *Vimars'inī* by S'aṅkara, the author's son, had already been published in this very series as Nos. 67 and 71 many years ago. The present edition contains another commentary also, namely, the *Vivaraṇa* by an unknown author who styles himself as Nārāyaṇas'iṣya; he is a disciple of the author. Only the first four chapters are included in the portion now issued. There is a very critical and scholarly introduction in English by the editor, followed by another in Sanskrit by Paṇdit N. Rama Sastri. In the Preface there is a footnote where there is a remark about another work of the author named *Mānavavāstulakṣaṇa* or *Mānavasamuccaya* or *Manuṣyalakṣaṇa*, that the name *Ṣaṭpañcās'ikā* given to it in the *Adyar Library Bulletin* in Vol. VI, pp. 41 to 51 is wrong. That *is* the name which the Adyar Manuscript gives to the work. After the text portion there are some very useful indices: verse index, index of citations in the commentaries, variant readings of the second commentary *Vivaraṇa*, index of *Mantras* cited in the text and in the commentaries and variant readings of the text. Except in the matter of the paper used and the printing and the get up, the edition has been executed with great skill. A work of this importance deserves better presentation so far as the form is concerned, besides the plan and execution.

EDITOR

Kavya-vichar, Gujarati Sahitya Parishad, Bombay, pp. 304. Price Rs. 4.

This is a translation of Dr. S. N. Das Gupta's Bengali book of the same name, by Mr. Nagindas Parekh. It is a manual of Sanskrit literary criticism.

It contains chapters on Grammar and Alaṁkāra, the ancient writers on Alaṁkāra, the merits and faults of drama, on expression, idealism, Aesthetic quality, on Rasa and Kāvya, and on Dhvani. Saṁskṛta illustrations are quoted and explained to illustrate the principles. In the end the opinions of western writers on these subjects are given with reference to the views given.

The book is a very useful one as it presents the standard views of Saṁskṛta writers in a form in which the reader can grasp them. The book fulfils a need in vernacular literature and deserves translation in other vernaculars.

P.B.N.

Kṛṣṇārjunavijayanāṭakam by Venkataramayajvan (Copies from C. V. Venkatarama Dikshitar, Vadakkanthara Village, Palghat), 1944, pp. 45. Price Re. 1.

This is a modern dramatization of the well-known epic incident connected with the Pāṇḍavas while they were in exile, of how a gandharva, Gaya by name, offended S'rī Kṛṣṇa somehow and sought thereafter the refuge of Arjuna who had to defend him against his own "guide, philosopher and friend." The author is an experienced writer with a large number of compositions, literary and s'āstraic, to his credit. The present drama in five acts is one more proof of his literary ability. The language in which it is written is easy, effortless and elegant; but it is to be wished that the author were stricter in the observance of the rules of grammar. On p. 18, for instance, चैलितुं न is preferable to चलितुन्न and गम्भीरता to गंभीरता. Otherwise this little book is an excellent addition to Sanskrit literature contributed by contemporary writers.

H. G. NARAHARI

Kāmaśuddhi, An One-Act play, by Dr. V. Raghavan, Published by the Amṛtavāṇi, pp. 8. 1946.

This is an One-Act play composed on the basis of the *Kumārasambhava* of Kālidāsa; but the original plot is slightly emended here in that Cupid, not Śiva, is now the hero, and Rati, not Pārvati, the heroine. The play is a useful addition to current popular literature in Sanskrit.

H. G. NARAHARI

Vernal Blooms, by Wm. Quan Judge, The Theosophy Co., Los Angeles, 1946.

A Golden Jubliee Memorial of the work of Wm. Quan Judge, a founding-member of the first Lodge of The Theosophical Society and one of its early Vice-Presidents, the volume contains articles on Theosophy as applied to metaphysics, methods of service, psychic and spiritual powers, historical notes, and is enriched with reminiscences of Madame Blavatsky.

A. H. P.

DR. S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR

In the death of the late Dewan Bahadur Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, Indian historical scholarship has become very much poorer. Born on the 15th of April, 1871, Dr. Krishnaswami Aiyangar took the degree in Physics and then turned to the study of History. He took his M.A. degree in it in 1899. He soon became an Assistant in the Central College, Bangalore. In his spare hours he devoted his time to research especially in South Indian History. His papers on the *Cola Ascendancy* and *Cola Administration* written in 1901 attracted the attention of Dr. Hultzsch, the then Epigraphist in Madras. The next notable paper was on the *Life and Times of Rāmānuja*, which was of help to Justices Sir S. Subramani Aiyar and Sir Ralph Benson in deciding a case involving the rights of the Govindaraja Shrine at Chidambaram. When he continued to be a professor in Central College, he cooperated with F. J. Richards and Rev. Fr. Tabard in the foundation of the Mythic Society, Bangalore. His book on Ancient India published in 1911 enabled him to occupy the chair of Indian History and Archaeology in the University of Madras in 1914. He continued to be the University Professor till 1929 when he retired. It may be truly said of him that he maintained the dignity of his profession.

Soon after he became the University Professor, his name became well known in All India, and that enlightened Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University, Sir Asutosh Mukerjee, not only invited him to deliver the Readership lectures under the auspices of that University but also made that University confer on him the Honorary Doctorate. His works won the appreciation and approval of All-India scholars who elected

him as the General President of the All-India Oriental Conference, and All-India Indian History Congress. He was soon appointed a full member of the Indian Historical Records Commission. He was further nominated as one of the honorary correspondents of the Archaeological Survey of India. The Asiatic Society of Bengal elected him one of their Fellows in 1931.

Dr. Aiyangar was a pioneer in the field of research in South Indian History. He dived deep into the mass of Tamil literature and inscriptions and wrote on the history of the Colas, Pallavas and Vijayanagar. The late Sewell acknowledged his scholarship with gusto. He was connected with the *Indian Antiquary* as one of its editors, and was for several years the editor of the *Journal of Indian History*. The one notable service done by Dr. Krishnaswami Aiyangar was to found a school of South Indian History and give helpful guidance to a number of young men who in their turn have become first rate historians. The Government conferred on him the title of Dewan Bahadur in appreciation of his services to the cause of higher education while the Mysore University recently honoured him with the degree of Doctor of Letters. Sir Shafaat Ahmed Khan spoke of him as the doyen of Indian Historians. Though his body has passed away, yet he is bound to live long by his several books, all of them original and learned.

V. R. R. DIKSHITAR

We deeply regret to learn of the demise of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviyaji on 12th November 1946, as we go to the press. A detailed notice will appear in the next issue of this *Bulletin*.

EDITOR HONOURED

THE formal ceremony of presenting Dr. C. Kunhan Raja with the Volume of studies in his honour was conducted at Nagpur on Sunday October, 20, 1946 at 5-30 p.m. in the Science College Hall of the Nagpur University during the days when the XIII All India Oriental Conference was in session. Mahāmahopādhyāya P. V. Kane, the well-known Sanskrit scholar, was proposed to the chair by Dr. Olivier Lacombe of Paris, the Cultural Attache to the French Consulate General, Calcutta. Prof. S. K. Belvalkar seconded the proposal and was supported by Dr. K. Godavarma. The Secretary presented the official report of the Committee. Prof. H. D. Velankar spoke a few words about the career and work of Dr. Kunhan Raja. He spoke of how Dr. Raja inspired all who came into contact with him by his deep learning, his devotion to work and the energy he put forth in all his scholarly pursuits. Added to this was his very cheerful nature, a buoyant spirit and a very enthusiastic perseverance. His work in the Madras University and in the Adyar Library is well-known to all. Recently he has been able to recover the rich collection of manuscripts in Bikaner for Sanskrit scholars by organizing the Anup Sanskrit Library and directing its many-sided activities. He has now started work on the Jaipur Palace collection of old manuscripts, and it is hoped that there too he will be equally successful. His many publications, both as books and as articles, have made his name known in all the countries. This Volume that is now being presented to him is a fitting recognition of his long years of useful work and it should be our wish and prayer that he may have many more years of life to continue the great work.

In presenting the Volume to Dr. Raja, Mahāmahopādhyāya P. V. Kane stated that Dr. Raja was a familiar figure at these conferences for many years now and that he had known him also for a long time. Though Dr. Raja came to a very responsible and high position as Head of the Sanskrit Department of the Madras University rather early in life, he has done full justice to the position assigned to him. He has done great work in the Madras University and also in the Adyar Library. He organized the Anup Sanskrit Library at Bikaner and is now extending his activities to other places like Jaipur. Continuing, the Mahāmahopādhyāya said that he was very happy to have this opportunity of associating himself with such a function. Dr. Raja, he said, fully deserved the honour. He has had a brilliant past and has a very bright future also.

Dr. Kunhan Raja, who rose up to thank those who conferred on him this honour, said that while expressing his gratitude for the great honour done to him he could not avoid feeling that a great responsibility was being placed on his shoulders by his friends which, he was afraid, he might not be able to bear. When he thought of the many persons who associated themselves with the presentation and the valuable contributions in the Volume, his heart trembled not knowing how he could do justice to such a great distinction shown to him. He regarded the contributions in the Volume as a direction from his friends regarding the standards that he is expected to keep up in his own researches. He promised to do all that was possible to come up to the expectation of his friends. He considered it even a greater honour that such a Volume should have been given to him by so great a scholar as Mahāmahopādhyāya P. V. Kane. The popular doctrine of evolution does not seem to fit in with the state of affairs prevailing in the world to day. We find decadence and degeneration every-

where, and this is all the more pronounced in the realm of scholarship. Thus the natural course of events stands in his way of even hoping to come up anywhere near what the Mahāmahopādhyāya has himself achieved in the field of scholarship. But work would be the ideal that he would be keeping before him in all his research activities. He had to struggle against many adverse circumstances which it has been the lot of Sanskritists to encounter. But Dr. Raja confessed that he could call himself lucky in many other respects. He had the great privilege of having been trained by great scholars like Paṇḍitarāja Rama Pisharoti, Mahāmahopādhyāya Kuppuswami Sastri, Geldner and Macdonell. In the University he has full co-operation from his collegues. In the Adyar Library he has nothing but kindness and help from the Director, Capt. G. Srinivasamurti, and the successive Presidents of the Theosophical Society. He has been able to train many students some of whom have already made their mark in first class research. He was closely associated in his work with many important scholars in other parts of India. Recently it was his privilege to have been able to organize the Anup Sanskrit Library at Bikaner, and is now engaged in examining the rich collection of manuscripts at Jaipur. The rulers of the different states of India have preserved for scholars a wealth of which India will one day be proud. And in giving the necessary facilities for the organization of these libraries, these rulers are only continuing the noble tradition of their great ancestors who considered it their chief duty to give patronage to scholarship. This is but natural for we can speak of each one of them along with Kālidāsa :

रूपं तदोजस्वि तदेव वीर्यं तदेव नैसर्गिकमुन्नतत्वम् ।
न कारणात्स्वाद्बिभिदे कुमारः प्रवर्तितो दीप इव प्रदीपात् ॥

Dr. Raja said that it has always been his policy to put forth as much energy to his work as he could command whenever there was difficulty, so that it may be overcome. But when there was encouragement from others, as in the present case, he would put forth even greater energy to justify such an encouragement. It was always his prayer that success may not rouse in him the feeling that his position had become secure and that he could take rest on the way. In order to avoid such a situation arising he would even pray, as Kuntī Devī did in the *Bhāgavata*, that there might be troubles and adversities ever in his path at every step.

He once again thanked all who were responsible for that day which he would regard as the proudest in his life.

Prof. N. A. Gore proposed the vote of thanks on behalf of the Committee.

The function was attended by many of the prominent delegates to the Conference. Many prominent persons from the locality, some representing local literary and cultural associations, were also present. Among those who sent messages for the occasion are the following:

1. The Elayaraja of Cochin
2. Sirdar Major K. M. Panikkar
3. Sir V. T. Krishnamachari
4. Sir S. M. Bapna
5. Dr. J. H. Cousins
6. Capt. G. Srinivasa Murti
7. Srimati Sophia Wadia
8. Prof. Louis Renou, Paris
9. Prof. F. W. Thomas, Oxford.

H. G. NARAHARI,
Hon. Secretary

Printed and Published by C. Subbarayudu at the Vasanta Press, The Theosophical Society, Adyar, Madras—P. I. C. No. 85—10-12-46.

THE ADYAR LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

ON 1st January 1936, Dr. G. S. Arundale, President of The Theosophical Society, formally announced the establishment of the Adyar Library Association, in grateful memory of the Founder of the Adyar Library, Colonel Henry Steele Olcott.

RULES OF THE ADYAR LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

I. The Association shall be called the Adyar Library Association.

II. The general object of the Association shall be to develop the Adyar Library as the International Centre for Eastern and Western cultural studies and researches in the light of Theosophy—"cultural" taken in its broadest sense as including Philosophy, Science, Religion and Art.

III. For the furtherance of this object the Association is:

1. To collect and preserve the necessary books and manuscripts for the Adyar Library;
2. To erect, furnish, and maintain the required buildings for the Adyar Library;
3. To establish Fellowships and Scholarships;
4. To hold regular meetings and conferences, at least once a year;
5. To receive and administer donations and subscriptions;
6. To do all other things judged conducive to the general object.

IV. There shall be three classes of Membership: (1) Ordinary Members, who pay an annual subscription of Re. 1; (2) Corporate Members, who pay an annual subscription of Rs. 6; (3) Life Members, who donate Rs. 600. The Corporate and Life-Members shall receive the *Adyar Library Bulletin* gratis. Such of them as are resident in Madras may be permitted to borrow books on a deposit of Rs. 20.

The publications of the Library will be sold at a discount of 10% to the members of the Adyar Library Association. A complete set of the Adyar Library Publications will be presented to Life-Members.

THE ADYAR LIBRARY

Director : Dr. G. Srinivasa Murti, B.A., B.L., M.B. & C.M.,
Vaidyaratna

Jt. Director and Curator for Western Section
A. J. Hamerster

Curator for Eastern Section :
Prof. C. Kunhan Raja, M.A., D.Phil. (Oxon.)

BRAHMAVIDYĀ

THE ADYAR LIBRARY BULLETIN

Editor : Prof. C. Kunhan Raja, M.A., D.Phil. (Oxon.)
Jt. Editor : A. N. Krishna Aiyangar, M.A., L.T.

Rates of Subscription :

Life Subscription	Rs.	100
or	$	50
or	£	10

		Per Annum	Single Copy
India & Ceylon	...	Rs. 6	Rs. 2-8
U. S. A.	...	$ 3	$ 1.25
British Empire	...	Sh. 12	Sh. 5
Other Countries	...	Rs. 9	Rs. 3-8

All Communications to be addressed to :

THE DIRECTOR,
Adyar Library,
Adyar, Madras, S. India